

# The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CX

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1920

No. 2856

## Contents

|                                                                   |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS .....                                        | 385 |
| EDITORIALS:                                                       |     |
| Constructive Steps After the Treaty.....                          | 388 |
| The Right to Strike.....                                          | 389 |
| The High Cost of Primaries.....                                   | 390 |
| The Price of Sugar and Other Puzzles.....                         | 390 |
| Coteries and the Country Cousin.....                              | 391 |
| THE ALLIED DOG IN THE UKRAINIAN MANGER. By Henry G. Alsberg ..... | 392 |
| ROBERT SMILLIE. By Arthur Gleason.....                            | 394 |
| THE FAILURE OF THE MARTENS INQUIRY. By Paul Wallace Hanna .....   | 396 |
| THE BLOSSOMING. By Harold Cook.....                               | 398 |
| IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter.....                              | 398 |
| CORRESPONDENCE .....                                              | 399 |
| BOOKS:                                                            |     |
| Witnesses from Russia. By Jacob Zeitlin.....                      | 399 |
| Scott Holland's Letters. By H. A. Lappin.....                     | 400 |
| The Mighty Average .....                                          | 401 |
| NOTES AND NEWS.....                                               | 402 |
| DRAMA: The Life and Death of Richard III. By Ludwig Lewisohn..... | 403 |
| ART: Painting and the Painter. By Glen Mullin.....                | 404 |
| INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION.....                              | 406 |

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

WILLIAM MacDONALD } ASSOCIATE EDITORS } FRED KIRCHWEY  
ARTHUR WARNER } MABEL H. B. MUSSEY  
CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, \$5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, \$6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

**A** WORN-OUT, war-exhausted people making a final desperate effort to preserve its new-old form of republican government—this has been the spectacle afforded by Germany during the last week. One thing is clear in the news at this writing—the communist workers movement has been making great headway. Essen and numerous other cities have yielded to the rising tide of the militant workers who insist that, since Ebert has failed to put through a real reorganization of the state and fled so cravenly before the coup of two poorly supported men, their way must now be tried. The question appears now to be simply whether the far-reaching concessions of the labor unions made by Ebert on March 20, in order to stop the general strike which he himself set in motion, will suffice to prevent the sovietizing of Germany. Even if the Ebert Government—without Noske—can bring together forces enough to restore order, the problem will still be whether it can repair the economic wastage of the last fortnight, and tide the country over the next six critical weeks. The world now faces the question whether the first part of Lenin's New Year's prophecy will come true—that 1920 will see the conquest of Germany, Italy, France, and Great Britain by the communistic doctrine—a situation reached because the Treaty of Versailles and its makers deliberately brought about this very collapse which now menaces the peace and order of Europe.

**A**S for Ebert's ten concessions, the labor unions are given the right to dictate the nomination of the Prussian (if not Imperial) Cabinet ministers; there is

to be complete and immediate socialization of all industries, including the nationalization of the coal and potash trusts, besides confiscation of all agricultural products and of all land improperly and unintensively cultivated—all of which brings Germany far along the road to Lenin. Whether Ebert or any one else in sight has the ability to put this program through is one of the puzzles which time will answer and soon. For the Allies, the situation is a grave one. With the Russian problem not yet worked out, they are faced with an alarming advance of radicalism to the edge of the occupied districts. To try to enforce the treaty to the letter just now is fraught with grave danger and to advance into the unoccupied parts of Germany is to tempt providence in a dozen ways. Fortunately, the French continue to remain calm and sensible, despite the evil influence of Foch, who plainly sees through purely militaristic spectacles.

**T**HERE are two ways to speak of the trial of the I. W. W. defendants in Montesano. One—the way of legal procedure—is to say that eleven men were indicted for conspiracy to commit murder in the first degree, which resulted in the killing of four returned soldiers in the Armistice Day parade in Centralia, Washington, on November 11, 1919. Of these defendants seven were convicted of murder in the second degree: that is, of killing intentionally but without premeditation. From this we must infer that the prosecution was unable to prove its case, and that there was no plan to attack the procession. The only conclusion, therefore, is that the killing took place in a riot which followed an attack by the marchers on the I. W. W. hall, as was alleged soon after the occurrence by one of the parade leaders at Centralia. The other way to speak of the trial is to say that it concerned the ability of men to claim ordinary privileges and rights if they belong to a radical labor organization. The affray occurred in a town controlled by big lumber interests, against which the I. W. W. has long conducted industrial agitation. Citizens of the town had previously destroyed a news-stand selling labor papers, and had wrecked a former I. W. W. hall during a Red Cross parade. The members of the union, seeing the agitation against them, and remembering previous lynchings and runnings-out-of-town, appealed to the public for protection against the business interests. In justification of their fears, the Armistice Day parade attacked their hall, and while defending themselves they wrongly shot to kill. One of their members, a service man like those in the parade, was then captured, tortured, and lynched. For this crime nobody was arrested.

**T**HE trial and its circumstances gave further evidences of what the I. W. W. preamble is so indiscreet as to call the "class struggle." The first Associated Press dispatches gave no hint that the hall had been attacked before the shooting. At once the affair was used as a pretext to inflame the American Legion and public opinion in general against the I. W. W. One of the most remarkable develop-

ments of this campaign was a single address, delivered simultaneously in thirty-one Minneapolis churches by pastors and eighteen members of the Legion, which utilized the wrath of the public not merely to condemn the I. W. W., but to point out an antagonism between Christianity and all forms of "Bolshevism." Meanwhile, in Washington, a lawyer who had defended the I. W. W. in the past and could have given valuable testimony at the trial, was himself indicted with the others in the murder charge—he was one of those acquitted. Although the Judge had admitted that Montesano was not a fit place in which to hold the trial, he refused a change of venue. A delegation from the American Legion was sent to attend the sessions. To offset them, a "labor jury," picked from the "regular" labor movement of the State, also went to watch and to judge. It does not need the verdict of acquittal rendered by the "labor jury" to point the moral; but how few Eastern newspapers have given any space to the regular jury's verdict and its significance!

**P**RECISELY as was to have been expected, the Lusk Committee has fizzled out in its report to the New York Legislature. It admits that "the laws already on our statute books, if properly enforced, are adequate to protect the institutions of this State and to preserve the constitutional rights of its citizens." Exactly so. This is what *The Nation* and other liberal journals have been saying from the very beginning of the Committee's performances, and not only as to the State laws but as to the Federal also. As the *New York World* points out, nothing but politics inspired the inquiry and nothing but politics is behind the various bills which the Committee has submitted to the Legislature in order to justify its existence. One of its bills is aimed straight at the Rand School. It proposes that education in the State of New York shall be fettered by giving to the University of the State of New York the right to license all schools and classes except church institutions. As the Regents of the University of the State of New York are political appointees of the Governor, in the past largely newspaper men, the purpose of this is obvious. More than that, the Committee would require every teacher in New York State to hold a certificate of qualification to indicate "satisfactorily that he will support the State and Federal Constitutions and is loyal to the institutions and laws of State and nation." That is, if a teacher were not "loyal" to the Eighteenth Amendment because he believed in the use of light wines and beer, he might be disqualified for teaching.

**M**ORE than a hundred of the men arrested in raids of the Department of Justice have been released by the Department of Labor because there was no case whatever against them. Of course, they can obtain no redress for their unjust imprisonment. As for the hundreds of so-called "Reds" imprisoned at Fort Wayne, Detroit, under conditions which would have disgraced the Russia of the Czar, they have risen in their misery and been shot at by their guards. If half of what is told about the condition of these men is true, Mitchell Palmer ought to be driven out of public life at once. Yet he heeds not their appeals that they be either released or deported, and when he was recently in Detroit had himself surrounded by guards lest he be attacked by friends of these victims of his abuse of authority. It is quite characteristic of the man that while bullets have to

be used upon these prisoners of his, who can neither get a hearing nor justice, he has recently come out against the action of the Republican majority at Albany in condemning the Socialist members and preparing to expel them. Uriah Heep had a great deal to learn about snivelling from this man, whom Mr. H. L. Mencken describes in the *Baltimore Evening Sun* as "one of the most obnoxious mountebanks ever in public life in America, and at the same time one of the most vulnerable."

**A** PECULIARLY unholy instance of profiteering has been disclosed in connection with the business of the Sheffield Farms Company, one of a group of large distributors who control the milk supply of New York city all the way from the cow to the consumer. This company has recently been urging farmers (reinforcing the advice by threats, it is said) to cut down production and withhold from the city 2,500,000 quarts a day that would normally lead to lower prices and increased consumption. It now appears, furthermore, according to figures submitted by a Federal fair price commissioner, that in 1918, when other persons were sacrificing to carry on the war, the Sheffield Farms Company did its bit by exacting a rate for milk that netted it 51½ per cent profit for the year; enabling it to pay a 14 per cent dividend, and raise its surplus to an amount greater than its capital. It is said that the war-time Lever act, which makes it unlawful to restrict the supply of necessities, will be invoked in connection with the effort to limit the milk ration of New York. It ought to be; but will it? Such promises have been made many times before without result. The Lever act was used to break the coal strike, but that affected profits. The effort to curtail New York's milk supply concerns only the lives of babies of the poor and the health of future generations.

**T**HE conviction of Senator Newberry and his sentence of two years in the penitentiary is as surprising as it is welcome—not that we have any vindictive feelings against the Senator, but because it is high time that some progress was made in putting an end to the buying of elections. The case against Senator Newberry seemed clear from the beginning, but the general belief in Michigan was that somehow or other he would escape punishment as so many rich and powerful men have done. It was thought that the Democratic machine would never dare to put the case through, because there are so many damaging things about the Democrats which the Republicans know. But the jury saw its duty clearly and particularly after the testimony of the defense, which was more damaging even than that produced by the government. It will be interesting to see if the Senate will be as virtuous in expelling Mr. Newberry because of his conviction as the House has been in twice expelling Mr. Berger because he too is under sentence of the court, though out on appeal.

**O**NE of the Paris newspapers made an effective retort to President Wilson's charge that France is now controlled by militarists when it declared truthfully enough that Mr. Daniels is "the only Minister of the whole world who announces a program of armaments to the limit." But Congress has taken a hand in taming the Secretary, the House Naval Affairs Committee having reported an appropriation bill for the Navy aggregating \$425,290,574 as against the final estimates asked by Secretary Daniels of

\$558,290,574. The Committee simply authorizes completion of the unfinished 1916 building program. That is certainly a bad enough waste of public funds, and it is already having evil effects abroad, having stirred up the big navy men in London to demand that England have "incomparably the greatest navy in the world," as heretofore. Fortunately, Mr. Long, First Lord of the Admiralty, has come out against this and has rightly said that the United States and Great Britain "should compete only in reducing their ample margins of naval power." Canada, too, has done the sensible thing, a caucus of the Government forces in the Canadian Parliament voting down the plan for a separate Canadian Navy which Admiral Jellicoe urged. But our House of Representatives insists upon an army of 300,000. This has led Representative Mondell, Republican leader in the House, to say that "no country in the world has ever attempted in peace times to maintain so extensive a military and naval establishment," the pending appropriation bills calling for \$850,000,000. "Prussianism in its palmy days," he declared, "never spent two-thirds of that sum."

**P**REMIER MILLERAND'S plea that France be given time to meet her debts will be listened to respectfully but doubtfully. The difficulties of reconstruction in a country whose greatest industrial centers lie in ruins are not minimized in the United States; but Americans are somewhat suspicious of the way in which France is using foreign loans. We do not wish to dictate the French budget; but France can hardly expect us to be enthusiastic over her extravagant foreign policy. Mr. Wilson's letter to Senator Hitchcock referring to French "militarism" was undiplomatic, but it was not untrue. If our remissions of interest are to finance further colonial expeditions against the natives of Syria and further Napoleonic dreams in eastern Europe, and to prop up counter-revolutionary movements almost anywhere, we can hardly be expected to invest heavily in further interestless loans, or to be particularly generous about past ones. We are not unaware that French taxes have been increased, but the fact remains that while France's blood tax, falling indiscriminately on rich and poor, was incomparably greater than ours, her rich men have not been forced to disgorge excess profits or bloated incomes in the proportion which has ruled in England. Until such taxes are imposed, the keen edge of our sympathy for France's predicament must inevitably be blunted.

**I**TALY'S new Cabinet under Premier Nitti is facing responsibilities certainly as heavy as any imposed by the war. Labor, exchange, foreign relations, food, coal—these problems and many others harass the Government and demand settlement, not to mention the problem of conciliating powerful political opposition from at least two directions. The new Cabinet is a coalition, but where there are so many parties to coalesce one or two influential groups are almost certain to be left out of any Ministry. The Socialists, with the strongest single representation in the Parliament, are of necessity in the opposition. Their party regulations permit of no dealings with a bourgeois Government, and no bourgeois Government would be likely to associate with itself Socialists of the intransigent stamp of the Italian party. Apart from the anti-parliamentary Socialist opposition there is that of the Catholic party, which, after some debate, has refused to enter the Cabinet. Its program is one of moderate radicalism and calls for a pacific foreign policy, woman

suffrage and proportional representation, liberal land reform and the breaking up of large estates, the recognition of class organizations, and fiscal reform involving an increased taxation of war profits. Such a program the Catholics hope to enact into law when they shall have "a preponderating part in the Government." Their opposition is likely to be less tempestuous and obstructive than that of the Socialists, but between the two it is not expected that the present Government will last long.

**W**HILE the diplomats in Paris and in London, keeping a wary eye upon President Wilson in Washington, are jig-sawing the map of Turkey into a mad picture puzzle, parts of what once was the Sultan's empire show a desire to do their own cutting. The proclamation of Emir Feisal as King of Syria, and of his brothers Abdulla and Zeid as King and Regent, respectively, of Irak and Mesopotamia is, despite Feisal's declaration of continued friendliness to the Allies, a warning that the fate of the former Turkish Empire cannot be settled as a purely Franco-British affair. England, during the war, cheered the Jews with a promise of their home-land, the Arabs with large prospects of independence, and the French with the Sykes-Picot agreement which divided the spoils between France and England, by providing for an Arab state or confederation of states in the interior, and carving even this territory into "zones of influence." The present occupation of Syria by French, British, and Arab troops roughly follows the Sykes-Picot lines. But the Arabs, who consider that they freed the country from the Turk, cannot understand the necessity of French occupation of the seaboard, and there has been constant fighting. Meanwhile the Arabs in Palestine are protesting against the prospect of rule by a Jewish minority. The Arab nationalist movement, which during the war was fostered by the British, has continued to gather power, and it seems probable that Feisal's hand was forced by the pressure of the Pan-Syrian movement. The Assembly of Notables, which proclaimed Feisal's kingship, grew out of a Pan-Syrian Congress, and the cable dispatches state that Lebanon, now occupied by the French, and Palestine, now occupied by the British, were included in the proclamation of Syrian independence. Feisal is too able a politician to flout any of the western military Powers, but the native movement for Syrian unity is dragging him on. Meanwhile the Allies, who were reported to be awaiting the decision of President Wilson, have occupied Constantinople.

**T**HE visiting nurse has become more and more essential to community life. She not only brings hospital care into homes of all degrees, resolving many domestic complications in the process, but her practical lessons in hygiene and prevention of disease have a more permanent value. Instruction received in the home, applied to immediate conditions and carried out with such appliances as are at hand, quickens the responsibilities and is more vital than any number of first-aid courses, or any factory-tooth-brushing demonstrations for child labor. For visiting nurses and for leadership in matters of public health, both town and countryside turn to the Henry Street Settlement in New York. Each step ahead taken by this center eases the path of other communities. Therefore, it is not a local concern only, but one of wide importance that the million-dollar fund asked for by Miss Lillian D. Wald should be raised to advance public health by means of the visiting nurse.

## Constructive Steps After the Treaty

TO *The Nation* the defeat of the Treaty of Versailles is a happy ending to the long and bitter struggle waged in the Senate. We rejoice that the good name of the United States is not to be marred by approval of a document conceived in iniquity and born of imperialistic sin; that the Senate of the United States has refused to approve a document which on its face convicted us of a breach of the national faith which was solemnly pledged when Mr. Wilson secured the armistice by the definite promise of peace upon the basis of the Fourteen Points. Other nations have seen no harm in forgetting their plighted word; fortunately the United States, chiefly through the courage and discernment of a dozen "irreconcilable" Senators, has been spared this disgrace. Yet we are under no illusion as to the motives which have led to this outcome. Only a handful of Senators have been influenced by principle or conscience or the country's honor. Contemptibly small politics have actuated both sides to the controversy; the Democrats have given an example of party servitude at the command of the White House which indeed affords a sad measure of the depths to which Mr. Wilson has lowered his party. As for Mr. Lodge, *The Nation* has no more love for him now than it has had at any time in the nearly forty years of his political career. A correct decision has been taken in the Senate as a result of mixed motives and impulses—among which a narrow nationalism has played a large part.

Nevertheless, the treaty has been beaten. The Senate has vindicated its constitutional right to its own independent opinion—despite the arrogant insistence of the President upon a course which would have entailed an unworthy compromise. But we have not been concerned with personalities in the treaty fight. The matter of chief interest today is the next step. With the treaty beaten and the state of war with Germany still continuing, what is the way out? The reply to this is the constructive policy which *The Nation* has advocated from the beginning. First, there should be an immediate declaration of peace with Germany by a resolution of Congress. If Mr. Wilson declines to approve the resolution, the burden of responsibility will be upon him. It is hardly thinkable that he would dare to veto it; but if he does, obviously he must find at once some *modus vivendi* which will permit the immediate resumption of business relations with the Central Powers, and the freest intercourse between those nations and the United States, unless all other nations are to deprive us of our proper share of trade with them. A continuance of the present anomalous situation, under which we are by a legal fiction at war when most of the world is at peace, is impossible for the year which must elapse before a new House and Senate—assuming a Wilsonian pro-treaty victory—can take their seats. In the two Knox resolutions already before the Senate there is material for a simple, straightforward declaration that the state of war is at an end. Senator France, too, has introduced a joint resolution providing not only for the reestablishment of peace, but also for "the calling of an international conference to institute a Concert of Nations to advise concerning international coöperation as a substitute for the League of Nations, and for a national referendum." The resolution "authorizes and advises" the President to make an immediate and separate treaty of peace with Germany "without annexations or indemnities."

These are the first constructive steps that ought to be taken. The calling of an international conference to revise the Treaty of Versailles is the next. Everyone ought now to see that that treaty is going to pieces of its own weight. The Allies have already receded from their demands for the Kaiser and for the German war-criminals. The Supreme Council has awakened—too late, perhaps—to a realization of the fact that the amount of the indemnities to be paid by Germany must be definitely fixed, and that loans and raw material must be supplied to that country. More than that, largely through the publication of Mr. Keynes's book, it is now realized that the reparations sections of the treaty are so badly drawn that the experts themselves cannot come to an agreement as to what they mean. The revolutionary outbreaks in Germany, from both the Left and the Right, are the direct fruit of the treaty and of the foolish spirit of revenge of those who framed it, and at the same time are the clearest proof that the treaty can no more bring peace to Central Europe than it has brought it to Fiume or to Poland. The treaty must be revised at an early date, if Europe is not to collapse; while if communism triumphs in Germany, or that mentally, morally, and physically exhausted country disintegrates in civil war, many of the provisions of the treaty, such as the reduction of the German army and payments and reparations now due, will be obviously impossible of fulfilment. What the opponents of the treaty have been saying as to its destructive rather than constructive character is borne out by the news from beyond the Rhine. A new arrangement must be made for the sake of all concerned unless everything which was fought for is to be lost; and this time the basis of settlement must be the noble principles outlined by Mr. Wilson.

As for the League of Nations, with the defeat of the treaty the way now lies open for the organization, in due course, of a genuinely democratic league. We have been unmoved by the argument that the treaty should be ratified and its revision left to the League of Nations, because the conditions of revision are such as to give no guarantee that adequate revision could take place. We have opposed the League of Nations because it is a League controlled by a star chamber, composed largely of the very men who perpetrated the madness of Versailles. There is good reason for believing that, within a year or two, many of the men who have most bitterly fought the present League of Nations in the Senate will be working for the formation of a really democratic league, which will include Russia, Austria, Hungary, Mexico, and all the new nations. To work for such a democratic league is the final constructive recommendation which we have to offer. The rejection of the treaty by the Senate, and the refusal of the United States to enter the League at this time, put the United States in the strongest possible position to demand alterations in it as the condition of our future entry. The most prominent English Liberals and the most ardent English supporters of the treaty, like Sir Robert Cecil, have declared that without the United States the League is unworkable. So be it. Let the League be remodelled so as to give assurance that it is to become a democratic, peaceful world-organization, and not the device for the despotic and imperial control of human affairs by four nations which we are now witnessing, and the United States will join.

## The Right to Strike

THREE recent contributions of more than ordinary interest to the mooted question of the right of public or quasi-public servants to strike, and, more particularly, of the propriety of teachers forming or joining labor unions, have recently come to our table. The Industrial Conference called by the President reported that "Concerted retirement of any particular group [of public employees] from their post of duty . . . is nothing less than a blow at the government itself. . . . The principle involved requires a surrender of resort to the strike." Judge Wendell Phillips Stafford, of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, an eminent jurist, in a Washington's Birthday address before a meeting of patriotic societies, took the ground that there "must be a surrender of this right to strike when men enter upon a service which is in fact, and which the law should declare to be, a public service." Public servants, it is urged, may be likened to soldiers. As such, "they have no more right to strike than any other soldier has"; it ought to "be a crime to strike," "as flagrant an offense as the desertion of a soldier who throws down his arms upon the firing line." Dr. David Snedden, of Teachers College, New York city, in an address printed in part in a recent issue of the *Survey*, thinks that teachers should not join labor unions, not because labor unions are bad, but because they are partisan.

*The Nation* has never advocated strikes as a solution of anything. It has looked upon the strike as, in the last analysis, a species of warfare, either an attempt by the strikers to obtain by force an advantage which was not likely to be obtained, at least so quickly, by legislation or negotiation, or else an ultimate protest against conditions which had become intolerable. Whatever the motive, however, the strike answers no fundamental question, rights no fundamental wrong. The increases of wages or the betterment of working conditions which are often the tangible results of strikes are rarely, if ever, permanent or even long-continued adjustments; the most that can be said for them is that they offer some mitigation of injustice while leaving the essential problem unsolved.

This is by no means the same thing, however, as saying that workers ought never to strike, or that they ought not to become members of unions which may, or do, advocate strikes. Whether or not a strike settles anything fundamentally, it is at least a protest, the only form of protest in most cases that employers or the public will heed. In a society which, like our own, is so organized that the greater material resource, the greater staying power, and the greater solidarity of class are on the side of the relatively few who control capital and employ labor, there is often no other way by which controversies between employers and their employees can be brought to a head, grievances ventilated, and material betterment obtained. It is incumbent upon those who oppose strikes to show in what other way, in many important instances, the undoubted grievances of labor in this and other countries could have been redressed, or public interest aroused over the points at issue. Moreover, as a practical matter, strikes are going to happen anyway, for the simple reason that there is no possible way of preventing people from quitting their work in a body if they choose to do so. The burden of proof is, of course, upon the strikers to show that their cause is just and that other remedies have failed;

if the strike is unjust, those who aid it must stand condemned; but the right to put the justice of their cause in evidence is not impaired because the burden of proof is upon one side rather than upon the other.

We cannot think that the question of right is essentially changed in the case of government employees, or of those persons, like teachers in public schools, whose occupations—to borrow a characterization from the Supreme Court—are "affected with a public interest." If the right to strike, under the conditions of moral responsibility which its exercise involves, is a right of the citizen generally, it is hard to see why it must be regarded as suspended because one accepts public employment. Judge Stafford's illustration of the soldier goes too far. Not only is the soldier enlisted in a specialized service whose only rule is force, actual or imminent, but the application of the rule to all civil employees would enable a government to hold to their tasks, under pain of death, employees who were being used to foster or perpetuate tyranny. The only ground upon which a government may rightfully demand the loyalty of those who serve it is that it governs well; if it governs ill, then the strike is such a rightful attempt at revolution as the Declaration of Independence itself defends. The remedy for strikes is not in forbidding them by law or suppressing them with bullets, but in the prompt redress of grievances and the pursuit of a policy which makes for happiness among the people. Machinery for redress is suggested by the Industrial Conference, but nothing can guarantee its wise use.

It is doubtless true, as Dr. Snedden holds, that the American Federation of Labor is a partisan body; most large organizations, not to speak of lesser ones, are partisan in that they advocate certain policies and oppose others. We cannot agree with Judge Stafford, however, in thinking that "such overgrown combinations of workers as the American Federation of Labor are incompatible with the welfare, if not with the very safety of the people." The trouble with the Federation is not that it is too large, but that it is not large enough; that it does not include intellectual workers, save in a few instances; that it has failed to appeal to unskilled labor, thereby opening a fertile field to the I. W. W.; and that it is controlled too largely by men of narrow vision and autocratic temper. Yet the same criticism may be lodged against the Republican party or the Wilson régime, both of which, by the power which they wield and the money or patronage which they command, may be a menace to the welfare and safety of the people. In neither case is the remedy for evil to be found in repressive legislation or in curtailment of the privilege of organization. So long as we have a rigid Federal Constitution under which politicians may intrench themselves in power and defy the voters who elected them, so long will combinations of workers struggle for their rights; what we need is a Constitution which the people may control. So long as labor and capital strive to get the better of one another in every industrial arrangement, so long will we have industrial warfare; what we need is freedom, coöperation, and a commanding regard for the public good. It is not to our advantage that, at a time when grave questions of social and industrial welfare press hard for solution, the right of combined action to force attention to public ills should be curtailed. Of all employers of labor, the Government itself should be the last to demand unquestioning obedience from those who serve it in civil capacities. For of all employers those who govern are least able to see or to admit when they govern ill.

## The High Cost of Primaries

ANYONE who cherishes tender illusions about representative government in the United States had better not read the current news of Presidential preference primaries; it is not written for the politically young. In North Dakota the Republican organization requested all candidates to remain out of the contest because the State is controlled by the Nonpartisan League, and the people might unfortunately express a preference that would embarrass the delegates. In spite of this plea, Senator Johnson rashly entered and won. "Hence," writes the *New York Times*, "delegates elected in that State who may be for Wood or other candidates will feel free to disregard the primary result and vote as they please in the convention." In Minnesota, on the other hand, where the primary law had been repealed, the Republicans held an unofficial primary at an hour when farmers could not conveniently attend, and with a light vote pledged the delegation to Wood. The rule seems to be: where you can get Wood delegates, hold primaries, but not elsewhere—regardless of the law and the will of the people. Why, then, have primaries at all? This seems to be the view of Governor Coolidge of Massachusetts and others who refuse to allow their names to be used. State primaries, they hold, are likely to produce a bevy of local favorites, no one of whom is strong enough to win at the National Convention, and as a consequence the usual trading will result in the usual compromise. In order that the people's voice may be heard, the people are requested to say nothing.

Prominent candidates are divided between those who seek the office and those who let the office seek them. Mr. McAdoo belongs to the latter class. He admits, to be sure, that he would regard it as "the imperative duty of any man to accept a nomination if it should come to him unsolicited." Yet he announces, "While I realize that under the primary laws instructed delegates from some States are mandatory, nevertheless I think it highly desirable that every effort should be made to send uninstructed delegates from every State where possible." This makes it clear that Mr. McAdoo is not soliciting the nomination from the voters. It does not make it equally clear that he is not soliciting it from anybody else, or show exactly how the voters can demand him if they want him. Mr. Hoover, in refusing primary support, is even more inconsistent, but more frank. "I belong to a group," he wrote, "which thinks that the American people should select their own officials at their own initiative and volition, and that resents the manufacture of officials by machine methods." Eight years ago that would have sounded like a good supporter of the primary. Yet he goes on, "I feel sure that I entered the race for nomination to the Presidency and undertook to solicit and spend the cost of propaganda and organization, this would be in itself a negation of the right American instinct, because of the obligation that it all implies." Senator Johnson, who still takes the primary seriously, expressed Mr. Hoover's thought more bluntly when he declared himself handicapped in the contest because he was not supported by interested parties who could supply him with a large campaign fund. And General Wood's condolences, offered to Mr. Johnson on that occasion, gave a final touch of cynicism. Millionaires are flocking to the man in khaki.

The shrewd political managers are thinking that it costs

a great deal more to elect enough pledged delegates than it does to jockey oneself into a winning position at the convention. If, like General Wood, you can afford to go out and contest enough primaries to give yourself a long start, and still have a bank balance left over for eventualities, that is a possible course of action. It involves, however, grave dangers. You may commit yourself too early for a fickle public opinion. You may even, as Mr. Hoover seems to see, make too early a choice between parties which are, after all, useful only as vehicles to office. If you do not win the nomination on the first few ballots, a compromise candidate other than yourself is almost sure to squeeze through. Then, too, the primary campaign betrays one into undignified attitudes. If you announce a platform, you appear to dictate to your party, but if you do not announce a platform, you appear either weak or vain, or both. Therefore, you have to do a third and worse thing: you have to declare principles which mean at once everything and nothing.

The old convention system, say the wily politicians, is simpler and less nerve-wracking. It obviates the waste of immense sums in painful publicity. It gives the people the same result in the end, and saves them money, because it does not necessitate such huge profits on the part of those who have to spend so much more under the primary system in order to control the government. To admit this would perhaps be wholesome for a public with too much faith.

## The Price of Sugar and Other Puzzles

"THREE cents on each dollar of turnover" is the modest way in which the American Sugar Refining Company states its profits for 1919 in the report recently sent to the stockholders. "This operating profit is a margin so narrow as to keep us very near an even break," says the report. Yet we observe in the same report that the aggregate profits were \$10,283,000, on a capitalization of \$90,000,000, one-half of which is preferred stock and the other half common, and that the latter is selling around \$130 a share. Moreover, this \$10,283,000 was net after payment of war and other taxes, including the stockholders' normal income tax, and after making what seems to be adequate provision for "sundry reserves." The margin is, perhaps, not so dangerously narrow after all. Let us restate the figures another way. The Company's selling price of sugar was nine cents a pound throughout the year, and the profit on each pound was three mills. The refiners' margin between raw and refined sugar is reported as one and one-half cents, or fifteen mills. Now three mills is obviously one-fifth, or 20 per cent, of fifteen mills. So for every \$80 which the refiner spends on refining sugar he gets back \$100. This looks a good deal like a 25 per cent. profit on the refiner's cost in doing his part of the job of giving us sugar. The margin now looks better.

What a lot of propaganda there is now-a-days in the way profits are stated! The American Sugar Refining Company made 3 per cent. on gross sales, 11 per cent. on capital stock, or 25 per cent. on operating costs. The first form of statement is good to give to the public, the second interests the stockholder, and the third might go to the Company's banker. Not so long ago we saw a widely-circulated advertisement on behalf of the meat packers, stating that

their profits were only 1.6 per cent. of the turnover. This sounds like a narrower margin than the 3 per cent. of the American Sugar Refining Company. But the meat man's penny is a nimble penny. Butcher's meat does not keep very long without cold storage, which is expensive; and there are other good reasons for quick sales. We do not know how quick the turnover of money is in the meat business, but if it is once a week or, say, fifty times a year, then, since fifty times 1.6 per cent. is 80 per cent., the annual profits in the turnover capital of the packers is quite reputable after all. It would be so even if the turnover were only once in two weeks.

From what we glean between the lines of the report of the American Sugar Refining Company, 1920 is going to be an expensive year for persons with a sweet tooth. Moreover, the explanation does not lie wholly in the devastation of war in the beet fields of Europe, for the amount of sugar grown outside of Europe in 1919 was nearly 2,000,000 tons greater than before the war. Last year's price, which was the highest for many years, including even the years of the war, was fixed by the Federal Sugar Equalization Board, and this company sold at nine cents a pound, less 2 per cent., throughout the year. Although sugar was doled out to the consumer in dribbles, the "consumption" of sugar in the United States in 1919 is reported to have been over 4,000,000 tons. This is 16 per cent. larger than in 1918, and more than 200,000 tons larger than in 1915 when the consumption was at its highest. Since most consumers felt that they were short on sugar in 1919, there is a natural curiosity to know the nature of this statistical "consumption." Other things past ordinary understanding occurred. Last January the retail price of sugar rose over night some 75 per cent. The day before that, there was practically no sugar to be had. The day after, anybody who had the price could buy sugar by the sack. Although the McNary bill, signed by the President on December 31, continues government control for 1920, the refiners are not discouraged. "In reliance," they say, "upon the public announcements appearing in the press of the government's purposes, refiners are purchasing their raw sugar supplies in the manner customary in normal times." Two significant statements explain what that "manner" means to the consumer. In August, 1919, the price of raw sugar, f.o.b. ship in Cuba, went to six and one-half cents a pound, and the Cuban Congress authorized the President to prohibit the exportation of sugar at any price less than that figure. Under date of November 12, 1919, the press carried this statement: "As a result of recent conferences of Louisiana planters with Attorney General Palmer" (whose raid on the high cost of living will still be remembered), "the latter has approved seventeen cents for prince yellow clarified and eighteen cents for plantation granulated, both f.o.b. plantation, as maximum prices; retail price to be eighteen and one-half cents."

The sugar business is an interesting game. The report from which we have quoted states that "in 1900 we [the American Sugar Refining Company, owned chiefly in Boston and vicinity] had 60 per cent. of the sugar business of the country, and our competitors [*sic*] had 40 per cent. In 1919 we had 27 per cent. and our competitors had 73 per cent." This kind of "competition" has made the price of sugar eighteen and one-half cents at retail with the approval of the Attorney General. How can a mere member of the consuming public fathom it all?

## Coteries and the Country Cousin

IF you listen to the eager coteries which are busy making us a sound American art out of the whole cloth which no one, they say, has ever cut in America, you will hear them calling the Middle West the country cousin, if not the maiden aunt, of the family of cultures approximately wedded on this continent. Listen further and you will hear that the only art of the Middle West is the best seller, and that the best seller as there practised is, like the little girl of the rhyme, merely sugar and spice and all that's nice. Indiana, you will hear, is the Attica of the Middle West, but an Attica without salt, where a stream of literary treacle rolls from Meredith Nicholson at his occasional worst to George Barr McCutcheon at his accidental best, and on and on, one vast substantial smile. Now certain facts in the case happen to be obvious to the point of aggressiveness. It was in the Middle West that American realism first struck roots; it is from the Middle West that its most eminent American exponents have come; and realism, as also its austerer offspring, naturalism, has flourished there with special energy and success.

If Edward Eggleston (of Indiana) is not the father of American realism the poor thing has no father. While Bret Harte was playing Irving and Dickens to California, Eggleston, having read Taine on the art of the Netherlands, set himself to work to portray the life he knew in the patient, undoctinaire spirit of the honest Dutch and Flemish. "The Hoosier Schoolmaster" is the first document in the history of our realism. In the very year of its appearance William Dean Howells (of Ohio) published his earliest novel and began a career which to the American fiction of the eighties was almost equal to an academy in its influence for reality in fiction. Did he not call whole herds of novelists after him on the paths of truth and reasonableness? Did he not teach the vast, shaggy humorist from Missouri nearly all that Mark Twain ever knew of literary criticism? Both Howells and Mark Twain, two of the three major novelists that their half century produced in America, lived away from the section which bred them; but E. W. Howe, who in the early eighties wrote the grimmest of all American novels, has never diluted the Kansas in him (though he was born in Indiana). The tradition was carried on by Hamlin Garland (of Wisconsin), who learned from Eggleston how to look hard at the life around him, became in Boston one of Mr. Howells's young men, and not only struck a new note in "Main-Travelled Roads" and "Prairie Folks," but in his "Crumbling Idols" set forth the doctrines which our naturalism followed for a decade. Frank Norris was born in Chicago, and it was there that the undeceived Mr. Dooley (of Illinois) and the arch-satirist George Ade (of course of Indiana) did their work at the turn of the century. On the very pivot came "Sister Carrie" by Theodore Dreiser (of Indiana), colossus and coryphæus of subsequent naturalism. Nor has the old movement stopped now that poetry has stolen from the novel its ancient thunder. Spoon River belongs to Illinois, and Winesburg to Ohio. Vachel Lindsay dances his juba to truthful tunes in Lincoln's Springfield; and it is in Chicago that Carl Sandburg mixes the music of the seven spheres with "good old mud."

There is more here than milk and water and honey. Perhaps the eager coteries drink only the softer beverages from the Middle West.

# The Allied Dog in the Ukrainian Manger

By HENRY G. ALSBERG

*Czernowitz, Bukowina, January 28*

IN matters political, as well as physical, it may be laid down as a general principle that nature abhors a vacuum. But the Ukraine appears to give the lie to this general principle. Just at present the territory westward of the Dnieper to the Dniester constitutes, governmentally speaking, a vacuum, or at least, a chaos. Denikin has evacuated the country, and the Bolsheviks, either designedly or because they are too busy elsewhere, have not occupied the vacant stretches of Podolia and the southwestern Ukraine. Nearly the whole country is in the hands of irresponsible bands, which label themselves either "Ukrainian partisans" or "Soviet governments," but whose principle object is to live off the cities.

These bands are recruited from the worst elements of the cities and from the villages. The cities are completely at the mercy of any armed force that may appear overnight, because the city folk have all been disarmed—very thoroughly disarmed. Every successive government, and cities like Mohilev and Kiev have had as many as twenty in the last two years, has been unanimous in one thing: each and every one has set the death penalty as punishment for any one in an occupied city found with arms in his possession. Consequently, a city like Mohilev may be taken and held by a dozen bandits, assisted by riff-raff, a few rifles, and above all a few hand grenades.

Meanwhile the peasants cling to the weapons which their soldier boys brought home from the wars. Every haystack and every barn is an armory. For instance, the village of Bronitz, where Uchow, Petlura's most popular lieutenant holds sway, possesses ten thousand rifles, two machine guns, and three small cannon. Now neither the Russian peasant nor the Russian bandit has ever read our Shakespeare, more particularly that passage which says "It is good to have a giant's strength, but not to use it like a giant." The possession of a hand grenade in the neighborhood of a helpless city population is a constant temptation. And the Shavian Russian peasant believes in the Shavian method of overcoming temptation.

For the purpose of reestablishing order, even the roughest, most wholesale type of order, whose minimum is a fairly large common divisor, there exist only two agencies: the one is to facilitate the renascence of Petlura; the other is to make peace with the Soviets and let them do the work of bringing order out of chaos. I wish to repeat in this connection my verdict of condemnation on Entente policy rendered some months ago. I said then that they might have taken advantage of popular sentiment and lifted their strangulating blockade against Petlura. With the least chance to breathe, he could then have made good his hold on the Ukraine. But instead, the Entente starved and worried him to the last extremity, and finally let Denikin temporarily wipe out Petlura and so bring down the whole temple of reaction on his own head.

On the other hand, had the Soviets been left alone, unharried by Denikin, Kolchak, and Company, and had Petlura been allowed to follow his own bent, which goes very far in the Left Socialist direction, he and the Soviets might have long ago reached an agreement by which stable rule in

the Ukraine would have been established. But the neither cut-bait nor fish policy has condemned the Ukraine to hopeless anarchy. Thousands of people have died of disease and starvation. What do I say: thousands? Hundreds of thousands have perished because of our stupidity.

When I was in Mohilev Petlura's people were extremely active. The Badko himself was expected in Kamenietz Podolsky shortly, and with his coming the tribes would rise. Until the bandits in Mohilev turned them out, the city was held by a battalion of Galicians—the soldiers half-starved and dying of typhus, the officers grafting on the sugar traffic. The second corps of the Galician troops was said to be in the neighborhood of Odessa, left there, like those at Mohilev, by the retiring Denikin army. All these Galician troops have a terrible time of it, fighting for their Ukrainian brothers, far from their home soil, bewildered and errant. Petlura drove them to desperation when he was forced to agree with the Poles to give up Ukrainian claims on Eastern Galicia, and so they went over to that tall promiser, Denikin, only to find themselves again at sea. But now they have determined to come back into Petlura's fold, and, believe in the secret reservations he made, when he surrendered their hearth-stones to the ancient Polish enemy. At any rate, the Galicians may form a valuable nucleus for Petlura's new army. There are battalions of them also at Winnitza, Chrisopol and Balta. In addition there are local leaders such as Uchow, who have villages back of them, armed villages, ready to join Petlura's armies. Some of Petlura's other chieftains are Dr. Devak, of Mohilev, and Robakinsky, a kind of travelling delegate, who was flitting about the country, carrying, I suppose, the Ukrainian equivalent of the fiery cross from village to village. There is no question that among the peasantry Petlura's is a name to conjure with.

But in the meantime the question arises: will the Bolsheviks give Petlura time to organize his forces against the onward rush of their steamroller? And here again comes in the mystery of the whole vacuum of the western Ukraine. Why have not the Bolsheviks before this occupied the country? With twenty thousand troops they could do the job from Jitomir to the Dniester right down to Odessa. Several reasons are locally adduced for their failure to occupy the vacuum. In the first place, they are too busy with polishing off Denikin and getting to India. In the second place, they do not want to come down to the Dniester and so scare the Rumanians into starting an offensive against them. In the third place, they may be anxious to make a working arrangement with the Ukrainians, even Petlura. By the time this arrives they may have come to an agreement with him by the bridge of the "activist" Ukrainian Bolsheviks, who are just as advanced in social theories as the Moscow Bolsheviks, but want local independence. I was told that both parties were already crossing this bridge and would in a few days meet half way. All that one can say is that the western Ukraine is perhaps one of the nearest places imaginable, for the city folk at any rate, to Hell.

We not only asphyxiated Petlura by a terrible blockade, but we actually destroyed him by allowing Denikin to attack his forces. We would let neither Petlura nor the

Soviets rule in the Ukraine. We promoted anarchy through Denikin. The bourgeoisie of western Europe deliberately sacrificed the bourgeoisie of southern Russia to this insane fear of Soviet success. Just now comes an American officer from Kamenietz with the same old story about our Red Cross. The population of Podolia is dying of starvation and typhus, hundreds of thousands of people, yet our Red Cross, after months of hesitation, of wondering whether it were wise to help a typhus patient dying in a Petlura hospital, had at last decided to send a bit of medicine and a few supplies by way of Galicia. And the Poles have been in Kamenietz more than two months.

The Bolshevik Government, as I have said before, did not spell absolute disorder and ruin in the cities. I asked in Mohilev, as I had in Kiev and in Kharkov and Odessa, of all classes, which régime of all the twenty that had existed in Mohilev was the best. And I received in each case the answer: the Bolshevik régime. It seems the International Brigade held Mohilev when the Bolsheviks were there last. This brigade consisted of Magyars and Czechs. They protected the population against the oppression attempted by the peasant soldiers. Only six persons were executed by the Bolsheviks during their stay in Mohilev. A contribution of four million rubles was levied, which, in comparison with the sums stolen during my stay by the bandits and their levy of six million, seems small and modest. The Denikinists, as so often, were the worst. Denikin allowed his Cossacks three days of pillage before he issued his usual hypocritical proclamation that "I learn that some of my soldiers are engaging in robbery and pillage. This must stop. I shall visit severe punishment on all those who do not obey this proclamation." And with the pillaging and murder went the crime of rape, a crime peculiarly encouraged by the Denikin officers, and indulged in by them. Under the Bolsheviks, aside from the actual executions, most of the disorder arose, as in Kiev, from inefficiency.

In Mohilev itself, despite the presence of the brigands, I found life was surprisingly normal. Reckoned in Rumanian leis, life could not even be said to be expensive. The town electricity plant was still working. Even the long distance wires were usable. People kept calling up from Schmerinka, where ruled a *soi-disant* Bolshevik band. The poor folk suffered terribly, however. All manufacture and business had come to a standstill. The poor had to pay in carbo-vances for food, and carbo-vances for them meant real money. And here I want to note a queer thing connected with that complicated question of exchange. All the laws formerly recognized as governing this subject seem to have been upset by the war. In Mohilev, for instance, the Ukrainian grieven (the half carbovance printed by Petlura) had four times the value it possessed in Kamenietz or Czernowitz. Yet no one was forcing the people to take grieven. In the present state of anarchy, every sort of Russian money was circulating. But the peasant has a blind faith in Petlura. He will take grieven in preference to all other money.

The health situation in Mohilev and vicinity, and in the whole of Podolia western Ukraine, is lamentably bad. Now that no more trains are running on the railroads, things may get better. It seems that practically everyone who travelled on the railroad got typhus. So disorganization has its good as well as its bad sides.

Travelling has become well-nigh impossible. The only way of getting about is by wagons. Aside from the fact that

the Russian roads in winter are unspeakably bad, the further difficulty presents itself of the attitude of the peasants. Like a voyager in Darkest Africa, one never knows whether a village one is approaching be friendly or not. If unfriendly, then one loses one's horses and baggage and money, and perhaps even clothing.

Among the Jewish population the advent of the bandits produced one beneficial result. It appears that a number of Jewish boys and girls had been carried away by the Bolshevik wave and had become actively Bolshevik. When Denikin's forces arrived, these youngsters had to flee. Now word went around that our "children," as they were affectionately called, although most of them were over eighteen years of age, "can come home." The bandits seem to have had no political prejudices.

As a matter of record it may be interesting to note that the bandits captured Mohilev with forty-four men, each man carrying a rifle for which he had two cartridges. In addition there were a few hand grenades. They succeeded against a battalion of Galician troops, of whom not over two hundred were able to do active patrol work, more than five hundred being in the hospital. Of the two hundred, a good many were disaffected owing to the fact that their officers had neglected them shamefully.

The evening when we left Ataki, opposite Mohilev, but on the Rumanian side of the Dniester, we saw the only locomotive steaming out of the station. Shortly after we heard a prolonged fusillade. Perhaps another revolution had broken out and by now the twenty-first or even twenty-second government may have taken possession of Mohilev.

What is the feeling of the Rumanians, official and unofficial, about the present situation in the Ukraine? Only one thing interests them much, and that is the question of Bessarabia. The Rumanians are haunted by the fear that Bessarabia will be taken away from them by some future Russian government. They think that all the Russians hate the Rumanians. Even the Russian bandits issued a proclamation to the effect that all Rumanians in Mohilev should be arrested and shot. The Rumanians, therefore, are interested in seeing the weakest possible form of government in Russia. They want a Ukraine, because it would be a smaller factor to deal with. On the other hand, they do not see that an independent Ukraine is something of an impossibility, or, at any rate, an improbability since Petlura's fall. So now the more enlightened Rumanian statesmen are thinking, and even openly talking, about peace with the Soviets. The entire Bessarabian delegation in the Parliament is for such a solution: peace on the basis of an acknowledgment by the Soviet Government of Rumania's right to Bessarabia.\* Unfortunately, the Entente does not permit Rumania to negotiate independently, and raises the deuce of a row when such a thing is mentioned. In addition the General Staff, a very great power in the land, and the Bratianists believe in anarchy in southern Russia as the best protection for Bessarabia. But the whole country is unanimous on one point: Rumania will not send her troops to fight in Russia against Bolshevism. If, nevertheless, it should come about that the Entente persuades Vaida Voivode, or any other, to plunge Rumania into an aggressive war on Russian soil, it will be a sad day for Rumania. There will be a revolution. And moreover the soldiers will not fight outside of Rumania to conquer Bolshevism or any "ism."

\* Since this was written negotiations have begun looking to a solution such as that suggested above.—Editor.

# Robert Smillie

By ARTHUR GLEASON

THE cable brings word that Robert Smillie has resigned from the presidency of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain. It is the tragedy of England that Smillie is not twenty years younger. His early life as a miner burned up his immense physical strength. "When you're burning the fire in the grate," he said to Lloyd George, "you're burning lives of men."

Smillie is sixty-three, and the lifetime of struggle, the war, and the immense public career of the last year, when he became the spokesman of the radical movement of western Europe, have made him old. On the day of his resignation I had a letter from him in which he writes: "The fight is still going on, and no one can say at the moment how matters are going to turn out." With his shattered health, he did not feel he could continue in leadership.

The British labor movement will now try to sink back into the well-travelled channels of "Lib-Lab" policies—that compromising evasion of fundamental issues. But Smillie's work cannot be undone. He gave his miners a standard of living—a wage that buys decency and hours that give a little sunlight in the brief bleak day of Wales and Lanarkshire. Not all the King's men can unscramble those eggs. He released forces that may be delayed (and with his passing will be delayed) but cannot be quenched. He has doomed private profits in coal-mining. In the program he brought in on wages, hours, nationalization, and workers' control, he laid down the lines of British industrial history of the next twenty-five years. These next five years are going to be a feeble, broken period. There will be sectional strikes on wages, footling compromises on government control of private coal trusts, government by mixed groups of liberal-labor nondescripts, a "progressive" foreign policy of disguised brutality, a diluted revolution with falling production. No devices nor phrases can save the old order. And in uncoordinated hackings and nibblings and passive sabotage, in angry separate groups, the workers will wreck the already gutted structure. But this irritating way might have been avoided if Smillie were twenty years younger.

More than any other single man in Europe, Smillie was potent in pulling the Allied armies out of Russia. The rank and file of labor was tired of the European mess, willing to let outsiders stew in their own juice, indifferent to causes and ideals. Smillie in hot sincerity touched those jaded nerves. A million miners had handed over to him their group-power to do with it what he wished. Literally he had lifted them out of the pit. In return they gave him a margin of freedom which no man in any other trade union or community-group could have exercised without splintering the association. In January of 1919 the miners in mass had no convictions about Russia or conscientious objectors or the blockade of Germany. But they let him voice his convictions in their name. In recent weeks the heart of the world has warmed toward Lenin and the moujik because the world wants wheat and flax. But the British soldier in 1919 quit killing Russian peasants, not because economic forces operated, but because a Belfast-Scotch miner hated murder.

The dramatic climax of Smillie's life came with the Coal

Industry Commission of 1919. In the King's Robing Room,\* he ordered the final line-up of the Old England—the ancient sporting squire, the abstract economist who said it couldn't be done. There has been no such pitiless publicity on the lives of workers, the profits of owners, and the "rigging" of the consuming public since the day of the early Blue Books. Sacred secret profits were unveiled to the eyes of the dispossessed. And other industries will now have to go upon the rack and have some fellow of Robert Smillie (if there is his like) wilt the witnesses by questions as simple as the speech of peasants and as direct as the judgments of the last day. All layers of society were probed—strata imbedded in English life since Henry VIII. England passed in review: classes and castes. One learned what they look like, and how they talk, and what philosophy of possession cheers them.

The most dramatic, though the least important, witnesses were the noble lords—Durham, Dunraven, Dynevor, Londonderry, Tredegar, Bute, Northumberland. It is easy to show why Smillie was right in summoning these lords. Their examination was a farce. They were bored or surly. Questions on their titles were absurd. But the fact that they had to come when summoned by a miner was a moral victory. And the word of it ran through Britain. Smillie was the lord high executioner, the judge, the people's man, and in the name of the people had issued orders to the privileged class which they unwillingly but humbly obeyed.

What one felt in the examination was that Smillie was the gentleman and that they were just a little caddish. His wider social experience, knowing the many lives of men, his gentleness of conscious power, his sense of equality, letting pass for a man even a millionaire parasite, all these enabled him to be scorned and patronized and outwitted without at all being defeated, or ceasing to be the head of the table. Smillie let them outplay him and wound him, because every blow they dealt him was aimed at the working class, and revealed their animus. So he was defeated by the lords in the King's Robing Room, but won a victory over them in the nation. Their retorts to his simple questions were swift, skilful, at times witty, and scored a brief success with the immediate audience. But when those answers passed out into the larger audience of the nation, it was found that in winning the skirmish they had lost the war.

DURHAM. No one has disputed my ownership.

SMILLIE. We are disputing it now. I am trying to be as fair as possible, to examine without bitterness. We allege that no title deeds exist that justify your ownership. The state is the owner.

One by one entered and passed the representatives of ancient families: Lord Dynevor, scholarly, pale, shy, with spectacles, stone deaf in the right ear; Lord Dunraven, feeble, on a cane, white hair at sides, bald top, white mustache, ruddy face; the Marquis of Londonderry in khaki, with a long head and a high forehead; Lord Tredegar, over six feet tall, broad-shouldered, reserved, handsome, bald, smooth-shaven, lean—a quite royal person.

TREDEGAR. I don't see why service to the country entitles a man to land.

\* See "In the King's Robing Room" in *The Nation* of April 12, 1919, and "British Coal Commission Hearings," in *The Nation* of June 14, 1919.

SMILLIE. Landlords claim land because the King gave it for services rendered in war. We wish a more equitable division among those who served in this war.

Smillie was able to conduct the inquiry because he had made his miners the most powerful revolutionary force in Britain. As Sidney Webb, historian of labor, says "The outstanding feature of the trade union world between 1890 and 1920 has been the growing predominance, in its counsels and in its collective activity, of the organized forces of the coal miners."

Finally, Smillie won for them a day of seven hours and thirty-nine minutes, and a yearly wage of £196. But he never let them rest in the "comfort" gain; he called them to keep leading all labor to the full emancipation. The social revolution, as he saw it and said to me, is incessant propaganda. "The working classes do not yet know what they can do. When they know that the power is theirs, in five, ten, fifteen years, there will be an avalanche. Then they will elect a labor Parliament and create a labor Government."

Legislation will follow, which will establish a socialist society, not by bloody revolution, but by education and votes. The socialist society will mean public ownership of land and of the key industries, with management by the workers of hand and brain. Smillie foresees neither state socialism nor syndicalism, but a balance between producers and consumers, of which guild socialism is one approximate statement.

Smillie has always listened to the young men and to the "left," and used their ideas for the program and their enthusiasm for the dynamo of the full movement—right, left, and center. He used direct action for three purposes. One was "poker": the threat of industrial pressure in order to make an executive government behave constitutionally. The second purpose was educational. He wished to familiarize labor with the idea of the general strike as a political weapon. His desire here was to keep the privileged classes from precipitating a conflict which would end in violent revolution. He feared a time might come when they would seek to disobey the mandates of a majority of the people. He wished the workers to have ready a weapon for forcing revolution back into the evolution of constitutional change. The third purpose was to have an instrument for forcing a general election when a minority Government was remaining in power and legislating against the will of the people. The general strike meant a general election.

Smillie's limitations are easy to list. He has never played the game. He is a ruthless immitigable idealist. So as a politician he is faulty. As the leader of labor, he has outpaced the untrained mass. They love the man, but are not yet ready to follow him through on the full program. When Debs made his speech to the jury, an agent of the Department of Justice said "You've got to hand it to the old man; he came through clean." That is the estimate of Smillie. He has not shaved his statements. Years ago, he ran (more than once) for Parliament from a Scottish constituency, and he was defeated. And his defeat came when his opponents challenged him on his fundamental beliefs, and as a socialist he came through clean. He would not shade by one vague word the truth as he held it. This forthrightness has cost him political votes, but it established him as an industrial leader.

An apocryphal story runs that Smillie and a party of friends passed the famous war poster of the child who asks his father "Daddy, what did *you* do in the great war?"

"Well, Bob," says one of the crowd to Smillie, "what is your answer when your grandchild puts it to you?"

And Smillie answers "I'll tell him I did my best to stop the bloody business."

The miners enlisted for the war, but let Smillie advocate peace by negotiation. If the Government had tried to silence him, the miners would have been less interested in enlisting. That is the way in which the British mind works. Instead, the Government asked him three times to take a job (one was that of Food Controller). The instinct of the common people never misled them into doubting his patriotism because of his pacifism. The vote of the miners at the end of the war proved this, when they elected him permanent president. Nor were his sons puzzled by his position. Two of his sons volunteered for the army, two were conscientious objectors, and three were held in industrial war work.

Once in private conversation, he gave away one secret of his unbroken industrial sway. He said "I never accept invitations." And in a flash, the mind's eye saw the brilliant noisy trade union secretary who frequents the Savoy; the delicately-balancing labor leader and M. P. who dines with duchesses and leaks away his early consciousness of mission; and all the line of the flattered who climb instead of march. Keir Hardie gave Smillie his spiritual vision. He gave him the shaped weapon of socialist propaganda through which his burning care for human beings could take expression. I learned what Lincoln must have been like from knowing Robert Smillie, with that tall, gaunt, and stooping framework, the face channeled with the lines of suffering and strength, the smile that is kindly, and the will that prevails.

With Smillie gone, what leaders will the miners have? In Britain the weight of dead matter, the councils of compromise, always prevail unless the champion has the background of experience and victory. Frank Hodges, the secretary of the Miners' Federation, is the most promising and already the most powerful young man (he is thirty-two years old) in labor. But he is untested, temperamental, and against him will be arrayed the immense inertia of the staff officers, the permanent officials, of the miners. These salaried men with their vested interests are still living in the trade unionism of last century when they climbed to power. Of such are Adamson and Brace and McGurk. Robertson, Straker, Winstone, and Herbert Smith are sound and progressive men, but they lack the final sublimation of personality, that blend of intelligence and power, which ratifies leadership. And apart from the miners, the labor movement in mass is lacking in leaders.

MacDonald? A beautiful bright blade, but the edge is blunted and no longer bites through.

Snowden? A pure, sincere, and loving spirit, but the war had him. He made his fight. A man has but one great fight in him.

Bob Williams? A canny negotiator, a natural force. He sacrifices permanent influence to his knack of erecting a façade of scarlet phrases.

James Thomas? There comes a slippery moment for the toe dancer on a tight rope.

Henderson? We are likely to see him in a few years at the head of the state. History will then deal with him.

Clynes? The Elihu Root of British labor.

The line of Alexander Macdonald, Keir Hardie, and Robert Smillie is extinct. It is a pity that Smillie is not twenty years younger.

# The Failure of the Martens Inquiry

By PAUL WALLACE HANNA

*Washington, March 18*

**W**HAT have you learned from the Senate hearings about Russian propaganda in America? Five members of the Foreign Relations Committee have been investigating the subject for nine weeks past. They have conducted public hearings in the presence of reporters. Have you the slightest idea what their inquiry has disclosed?

If you have learned nothing from the hearings you are no worse off than a majority of the Committee itself. Senators Moses, Borah, Brandegee, Shields, and Pittman compose the group of investigators. Moses is chairman. Neither Shields nor Pittman has been present at a single hearing. Borah has not spent an hour in the hearing room since the first of February. Brandegee attends nearly three-fourths of the time. Senator Moses commonly conducts the inquiry entirely alone. To such dregs of interest have we come respecting "Bolshevism," which every newspaper yesterday described as the militant, deadly foe of all you hold dear in this world and the next.

In the first week of January Senator Moses announced that his Committee would concern itself with a search for facts. He would tolerate neither the inquisitorial tactics of the hysterical Lusk Committee nor possible attempts by Soviet champions to advertise the new Russian idea while pretending to explain the conduct of its official envoy in America. It was a hopeful promise. Counter-revolution had been utterly smashed in Russia. The Soviet Government had clearly come to stay indefinitely. Every Cabinet in Europe was preparing to deal with it. The hour was ripe for grown-up Americans to clear their heads of propaganda fumes and to ascertain upon what terms the Communist Government of Russia was ready to associate with the world. Senator Moses sounded the keynote of an intelligent purpose, and for two weeks he and his colleagues on the sub-committee adhered to its tone. Then the Senators abdicated. They turned their office over to the counsel for the Committee, Wade H. Ellis. Since then the hearings have constituted a pale imitation of the Lusk Committee proceedings—pale because the press is so far ahead of the Senate in its grasp of foreign affairs that the reporters contemptuously refused to exploit the police court canards which Mr. Ellis brought on from New York.

Before the advent of Mr. Ellis, Senators Moses, Borah, and Brandegee were insistent but respectful in their questioning of Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, who, at all but two of the hearings, has been the only witness before the Committee. They procured from the witness a statement of his original instructions from Moscow, received at the time of his appointment in January, 1919, and quizzed him at length on the measures he had taken to follow them out. Thus, in the course of half a dozen brief hearings Mr. Martens made the following main contentions respecting his mission in the United States:

- (1) That his sole task here is to establish friendly relations between the United States and Russia—by having the State Department recognize the Soviet Government, if possible; without such official recognition, if need be.
- (2) That the State Department has studiously ignored all of his communications, including his repeated offer to

transport to Russia all Russian citizens against whom the Attorney General has been making raids and threats of wholesale deportation.

(3) That many American firms have made contracts with Mr. Martens's bureau to supply goods to Soviet Russia, while 900 other firms have in writing solicited such contracts.

(4) That appeals issued from Moscow urging American workmen to revolt were measures of justifiable retaliation taken at a time when the American administration was waging an undeclared war on Russian soil.

(5) That no such efforts to provoke revolution in America have been made by the Moscow Government since Mr. Martens opened his bureau here.

(6) That Mr. Martens would like to see a Soviet régime in the United States, but knows it is for the American masses themselves to decide if and when they desire to make the change.

Explaining that the greater part of his work here had been directed toward the procuring and listing of technical engineers and mechanics for subsequent employment in Russia, Martens desired to lay before the Committee all the details of this activity. The Committee has so far failed to admit such evidence.

There is nothing but rumor to explain the decision by Senator Moses—made with obvious reluctance—to abandon the pursuit of facts and turn the proceedings over to Mr. Ellis and a corps of aides graduated by the Lusk Committee. Senator Moses is one of the managers of General Wood's campaign for the Presidency. Rumor says that the Wood strategists thought votes might be made by a spectacular crucifixion of the "Bolshevik envoy"; or that the Union League Club of New York, which capitalized the Lusk Committee raids, felt obliged to discredit Mr. Martens in the higher court which threatened to acquit him at Washington. Senator Moses is a candidate for reelection in New Hampshire, and the Union League Club can deliver more votes than Mr. Martens controls in that region. In private conversation Senator Moses has said within the month that the Soviet Government will endure and enjoy amicable relations with the United States before long. But Mr. Martens has been painted so black in the American press, the Senator thinks, that Lenin will have to send some one else to take his place here. So a little more black smeared on by Mr. Ellis will not do us any harm! When Mr. Ellis assumed charge, Senator Borah withdrew in disgust and has been in the Committee room only a few minutes since. Senator Brandegee has come oftener but has had little to say beyond supporting Senator Moses when, for the sake of the record, it became necessary to curb Mr. Ellis. Moses and Brandegee have tolerated a scandalous and futile degradation of the Senate, but they have been at pains to avoid a more direct participation.

It should be recalled that Attorney General Palmer procured from Secretary Wilson a warrant for the deportation of Mr. Martens, and widely advertised his purpose to execute it as soon as the Senate should conclude with the star witness. So the hearing room under Mr. Ellis has been set with innumerable secret service men and legal aides to the Attorney General. Several times the news agencies were

informed that Mr. Martens would be seized that day, but the seizure has not occurred.

What has Mr. Ellis proved, or tried to prove, in his capacity of counsel for the Senate Committee? The official report of this second stage of the hearings shows that Mr. Martens has been plied with an endless stream of hypothetical questions concerning what he might think or do in circumstances that do not exist outside the imagination of Mr. Ellis. In the realm of concrete things, and as opposed to what the witness set forth in the beginning with respect to his mission here, Mr. Ellis strove to establish:

(1) That Mr. Martens was *not* designated by the Moscow Foreign Office, but by a self-constituted committee in New York.

(2) That Mr. Martens *was* carefully selected by the Moscow Foreign Office, because of his long association with Lenin, to carry out the plan of the Third (Communist) International to overthrow the American Government.

(3) That the commercial branch of the Soviet Bureau is merely a blind to conceal revolutionary propaganda.

(4) That Mr. Martens is a member of, and controlled in all his activities by, the Russian Socialist Federation, a group of Slav immigrants whom Attorney General Palmer has outlawed in the United States.

To support these four main charges Mr. Ellis referred to three items of evidence. The first he himself repudiated by withholding it from the record, the second produced a crushing rejoinder from Moscow, and the third was so flimsy that, like all the others, the reporters ignored it. Toward the close of one hearing Mr. Ellis began reading from what he said was a report by Mr. Martens to agents in Europe, which some one had intercepted somewhere. The "report" named two or three Russians in the United States and Canada, and spoke with satisfaction of their work under Mr. Martens to instigate rebellion here. Mr. Martens immediately denounced the papers as a forgery that he would be pleased to expose. Mr. Ellis never again referred to the "report" and declined to place it in the record. What he knew of its origin may be inferred from that act. It was the only evidence produced by the prosecution to sustain the charge that Mr. Martens is a plotter against American institutions. Many pages of the record are covered with questions and answers about an alleged Communist courier whose capture at Riga with concealed diamonds "worth 2,000,000 rubles," and instructions to American communists, had been recited in the New York Times weeks before. Mr. Martens denied any knowledge of the captive, and Mr. Ellis could supply nothing beyond some State Department photostats forwarded from Riga and containing nothing new. Justly or otherwise, everyone recalled the Sisson documents, which the Secretary of State endorsed.

It must be kept in mind that local police and Mr. Palmer's secret service men have been watching every move by Mr. Martens and his staff for a year past. He has addressed public meetings of three sorts—to celebrate his appointment, to protest against military intervention in Russia, and to commemorate the second anniversary of the Soviet Government. All that he and others said on those occasions was carefully recorded by Mr. Palmer's stenographers. Mr. Ellis read many extracts from speeches by other men, but Mr. Martens has pleaded in vain for Mr. Ellis to quote from Mr. Martens's own addresses. "You have been very careful in what you said," Mr. Ellis laughs. "I am not responsible for what others say," Mr. Martens insists.

The Soviet representative attended the annual conference of the Russian Socialist Federation in Detroit last summer. That organization later printed its own report of the proceedings. Mr. Ellis used that report at the Senate hearings and sought to show that the gathering had been secret and gave proof of the Federation's control over Mr. Martens. Mr. Ellis concealed or ignored that portion of the report which told how Mr. Martens "drove our committee out of his office," until the witness compelled him to produce it. Mr. Martens did this by first reading into the record his own speech to the Detroit gathering, in which he told the Russians that the American labor movement would develop along lines dictated by the American working class, not as immigrant groups might prefer. What made Mr. Ellis abandon all subsequent references either to the Detroit meeting or the Russian Socialist Federation was the copy of a letter dated August 29, last, and received by the Federation's executive committee from the Moscow Commissar for Foreign Affairs. The letter reads:

Esteemed Comrades: A letter from you has reached us, demanding establishment of your control over Comrade Martens. It presents a number of misconceptions of the most gross character.

First, you have a wrong conception of the position of Comrade Martens, who is the representative of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, and not of the Communist party or of the Third International, and whose duties are determined accordingly. You have also an altogether perverted conception of the inter-relations between Soviet authorities and the local organizations of the Communist party (Bolsheviks) of Russia, as well as your own relations in respect to the Communist party of Russia.

To take an instance. The military commissions, and the commanding organs of the Red army in general, are controlled by political commissars appointed by the central authorities, and not at all by local branches of the soviets. Also, local military commissariats are not subject to the control of local organizations of the Communist party of Russia.

On the other hand, your organization cannot in any manner whatsoever be regarded as analogous to local organizations of the Communist party of Russia. It is not subject to the control of the Communist party of Russia and of its executive committee, and your activities are absolutely unknown to the latter.

However, your attacks upon the official representative of the Soviet Government in America have a very detrimental and disintegrating effect. You are discrediting the Soviet Government in the person of its local representative, and thereby you seriously damage its political interests. We therefore address you, urgently calling your attention to the necessity of ceasing your attacks against our representative, and of not demanding of him submission to your control, which is unacceptable.

Senator Moses had ruled in January that Mr. Martens must not attempt to describe conditions in Russia, the inquiry having to do only with his own acts in America. With the appearance of Mr. Ellis that ruling was trampled under foot. Mr. Ellis insisted upon a full recital of, and argument over, the nationalization of land, socialization of banks and industry, disfranchisement of the bourgeoisie, and arming of the proletariat. Ex-Senator Hardwick, counsel for Mr. Martens, reminded the chairman that Russian internal affairs had been ruled out of the inquiry. Mr. Ellis replied that no conception of Mr. Martens's purpose in America could be grasped by the Senate without a complete description of what Mr. Martens's Government had wrought in Russia. Senator Moses reluctantly sustained Mr. Ellis, with the mild reservation that Mr. Martens should subsequently

be free to speak of Russian conditions—perhaps. The only novelty produced by this excursion into Russia was a careful explanation by Mr. Martens that social revolutions come from the masses and cannot be prevented when they are due; that the proletariat constitutes a majority in every country, and that violence is justified only when a majority of the people, having voiced their wish for a change, are forcibly opposed by a ruling minority. "It is then I believe in force against force and violence against violence," he said.

At times Senator Moses tried to take a sympathetic interest in the labor of his counsel. When Mr. Ellis read from the speeches of men who furiously attacked the American Government from platforms where Mr. Martens sat, Senator Moses would ask Mr. Martens if the latter thought a British or French diplomat would be tolerated in the United States if he should lend the encouragement of his presence to such assaults upon the Government to which he was accredited. Mr. Martens did not meet this hypothetical question by asking Senator Moses to imagine the feelings of a British or French ambassador living in the United States while American armies invaded France or England without a declaration of war. He answered simply "I do not know."

On March 4 Mr. Ellis announced that he had no more questions to ask of Mr. Martens, and next day the hearings were adjourned, subject to the call of the chairman. An inquiry that was lost in futility almost from the start is entirely submerged by the politics of Presidential candidates. There are both votes and public service to be achieved by a fearless, intelligent execution of the Senate resolution to expose both or all kinds of Russian propaganda in America. The sub-committee has frittered its time away. It has exasperated the representative of 160,000,000 Russian people. It promises to adjourn without calling or inquiring after the agent of a few thousand *émigré* Russian royalists who still styles himself "Ambassador" and lives luxuriously on money loaned by the United States Government.

## The Blossoming

By HAROLD COOK

THIS street, they say, is very fine  
Edged thus with poplars in a line,

And that one twisting round the block  
That leads at length to Dummal Dock

Is full of foreign men and queer  
To whom you'd better not give ear.

In one street murder sits alone;  
Its gutters blanch with whitened bone.

Into another one are hurled  
The unhappiest women in the world.

Yet I walk down these streets today  
And find no trace of all they say.

The cobbles are as soft as grass;  
The winds drop sunlight as they pass,

And every street a blossom seems,  
So full my eyes of you and dreams.

## In the Driftway

THE Drifter has been studying a recent photograph of King George V with his trousers creased down the sides, and is ready to adopt the new style provided: (1) that it tends to postpone the day when trousers break through at the knee; (2) that after they have broken through it tends to conceal the fact from the public gaze. Pending settlement of these points, the Drifter will continue the style he has followed with satisfaction for many years—which is to let his trousers go uncreased.

\* \* \* \* \*

THE Rev. William T. Manning, rector of Trinity Church, New York, says he would rather see the war begun again than that the Turk should remain in Europe. And if the war should begin again, the Rev. Mr. Manning would probably become a camp chaplain as before, and in the name of Christ exhort his fellow men to kill one another, taking care all the while to keep himself out of the number of the killed or the killers. The Rev. Mr. Manning is a famous "fighting parson" by proxy.

\* \* \* \* \*

THAT the son of a Forty-Eighter, who in America was the warm friend of Carl Schurz, Henry Villard, Franz Sigel, Abraham Jacobi, and others who came to this country because of their refusal to bow down to the kings of Germany, should be the man to lead a reactionary *coup* in Berlin is one of the ironies of fate. Wolfgang Kapp is the son of Friedrich Kapp, one of the most admired and respected of the Forty-Eighters. Of great learning and culture, a devoted American, a keen student of our political affairs, the author of several still authoritative books on the Hessian soldiers in the Revolution and the German immigrant to the United States, and for a time Commissioner of Immigration, Friedrich Kapp spent his declining years in Berlin in the attractive apartment house in the Tiergartenstrasse which was also the home of Georg Siemens, one of the greatest German financiers. It was also the residence of that staunch Berlin liberal, the late Dr. Theodor Barth, for years editor of the *Berlin Nation* which he founded and named after the *New York Nation*. The elder Kapp moved to Berlin, not as one New York newspaper has remarked, because he liked Germany better than the United States, for he was at all times a good American and a good liberal, hating Bismarck and all his works. It would have pained him, indeed, if he could have realized that his son would for five days rule Germany in the interest of Kaiserism and reaction and by doing so bring his native land to the verge of a catastrophe.

\* \* \* \* \*

OF all sad words of tongue or pen the saddest are these: "You've grown fatter since I saw you last."

THE DRIFTER

## Contributors to This Issue

ARTHUR GLEASON is an American writer of magazine articles and books who has made a special study of British labor questions.

PAUL WALLACE HANNA is the Washington correspondent of the *New York Call*.

## Correspondence

### Community Journalism

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The rank and file of newspaper men rejoice to see that the people are beginning to consider newspapers as public utilities. Your recent articles have stimulated interest in the question of who shall control the press.

Objections to official state ownership of newspapers have been made particularly patent by the misuse of government propaganda. That a new era is opening for journalism is assured. In North Dakota the plan has taken the form of community ownership of newspapers. In each county of our state the farmers with a sprinkling of liberal-minded business and professional men, have financed a weekly paper published at the county seat. In Grand Forks, an association of 1,200 small stockholders have for almost two years been printing an independent daily newspaper. Through this medium the political and economic aims of the organized farmers have been explained to a circle of ten thousand readers, many of them city folk who had never been allowed to learn through the privately controlled newspapers of the purposes of the Nonpartisan League.

The Board of Directors of the *Grand Forks American* consists of four farmers and one business man. The policy that has been pursued is one of engaging an editor and allowing him to run the newspaper without interference from stockholders or directors. The knowledge that he has no other duty than to print the unbiased news and write editorials in an interpretative vein has been enough to guide the editor's policy.

All things are not perfect under this system, since the *Grand Forks American* is dependent on advertising for a considerable part of its support. However, against the pressure of business men who wish to claim the ancient privilege of dictating newspaper policy through the insertion or withdrawal of their advertisements, the *American* has the backing of 1,200 substantial farmer owners who can bring to bear considerable weight by mobilizing their buying power and trading with business men who are fair to their newspaper enterprise.

PAUL GREER, Editor, *Grand Forks American*  
Grand Forks, North Dakota, March 10

## The Purpose of Palmer Propaganda

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. George F. Bowerman in his letter of the 19th ultimo *in re* your attack on Attorney General Palmer intimates that, in sending out the letter you quoted, the Attorney General was "exercising one of the legitimate functions of his office."

Will Mr. Bowerman kindly quote chapter and section of any law which makes it the duty or even one of the legitimate functions of the office of Attorney General of the United States to conduct propaganda of any kind whatsoever? Will he quote any Act of Congress appropriating funds for propaganda work? Would Mr. Bowerman approve if the propaganda of the Attorney General was directed in favor of the so-called parlor Bolsheviks rather than against them?

And of course Mr. Palmer would gladly propagandize in favor of the parlor Bolsheviks if he thought it would be a good political move. Like most candidates for office, he has no convictions. He is an opportunist pure and simple; otherwise he could not reconcile his record before and his boastfulness after our entry into the World War.

So far from employing only his leisure time, as Amelia Maxson innocently supposes, he employs most of his time in exactly the kind of activities for which you have criticised him, and the purpose of these activities is to get the nomination and the election to the office of "Succ. to Woodrow Wilson, Ltd."

Hillsboro, New Mexico, March 13 EDWARD D. TITTMANN

## Books

### Witnesses from Russia

*From Liberty to Brest-Litovsk. The First Year of the Russian Revolution.* By Ariadna Tyrkova-Williams (Mrs. Harold Williams). London: Macmillan & Co.

*Bolshevik Russia.* By Etienne Antonelli. Translated from the French by Charles Carroll. Alfred A. Knopf.

*Russia in 1919.* By Arthur W. Ransome. B. W. Huebsch.

*Open Gates to Russia.* By Malcolm W. Davis. Harper and Brothers.

FOR those who still find it profitable to lash themselves into a fury against the existing régime in Russia, there is an excellent book by Ariadna Tyrkova-Williams. Her narrative sweeps the reader along by the force of its inner conviction, by its genuinely Russian intensity. It is single-minded and concentrated, for, as a member of the Cadets, Mrs. Williams herself played a passionately partisan rôle in the struggle. She has remarkably abundant and accurate information, though of somewhat too generalized a character. She might have made her book a skilful and telling arraignment of her political opponents if she could have restrained her quite intelligible hatred and indignation. But she magnifies the crimes of the Bolsheviks to an inhuman degree. She is ready to believe them guilty of every offence they have ever been charged with, even when she admits that proof is lacking. She is much too eager to retail scandals about their private life. She employs intemperate and melodramatic language. Lenin and Trotzky, she says, are "like two convicts bound by the same chain; together they go from crime to crime. And when they perish they will perish together." She betrays her prejudice and weakens her case most seriously in loading on the Bolsheviks the blame for all that Russia has suffered since the beginning of the revolution. She represents them as the dominant factor determining the policy of the nation at a time when by her own statement they were only a miserable, skulking minority. She makes them the cause of a disease of which they were only the symptom. Their actions when in power she also speaks of without the least qualification, as if they had put in force every principle of the Marxian program. "My aim," says Mrs. Williams, "has been to avoid being carried away by my personal impressions, and to be as objective as one may be when writing of the sufferings, the convulsions, and, too often, of the humiliations, of one's own people." Such an aim it was not in human nature to carry out while the conflict was still on and the wounds unstaunched.

For writing history M. Etienne Antonelli has a great advantage over Mrs. Williams in not being a Russian. In his capacity of military attaché to the French embassy he had excellent opportunities for observation. In addition he brought to his task the equipment and temper of the trained scholar. As a result he has not only produced the most authentic record that has yet appeared of the opening months of the second revolution, but has written some of the clearest and wisest words which have thus far been uttered about it. In describing the deeds of Lenin's government he is careful to note the difference between its extreme pronouncements and its actual performance. While not inclined to minimize the "cunning, violence, deceit, treachery, double-dealing, brutality, and tyranny" of the new rulers, he is sagacious enough to penetrate more deeply into the causes of their power. He sees Bolshevism not as a system imported by a few individuals and imposed by a few bayonets, but as a movement answering perfectly to "the childish simple aspirations of the Russian masses" and to the historical conditions of the time of the Russian revolution. He shows how Lenin and his followers have maintained their power by great flexibility of mind—it might be called moral unscrupulousness—and by remarkable skill in turning to their profit the indecision and differences of their opponents. But whatever the causes

and whatever the methods, the essential point to take note of is in the statement that "the great mass of the people, with the exception of a few million bourgeois, was won over to the support of the existing order," and that every move of the opposition came to be regarded as an attempt to reestablish the social slavery of the masses under a form more or less disguised. In recognizing this, M. Antonelli does not make himself the champion of the Bolshevik system. On the contrary, he explains how it operates to create anarchy in the social relations of individuals, and waste and ruin of the material economic forces. But even in its purely negative aspects this system may be regarded as ultimately beneficent. "Perhaps, indeed, unbiased history will have to recognize that by their efforts to keep the masses at least in appearance in the path of a socialistic ideal, they were the only ones who could have prevented the complete miscarriage of democracy in Russia and the dissipation of the Revolutionary movement into a series of ineffectual peasant uprisings."

In spite of what he says about the destructiveness of the Bolsheviks (and how could the first six months have been anything but destructive?), M. Antonelli concludes his analysis with a word of cheer. He quotes a remark made to him by a diplomat in February, 1918, that after the war the League of Nations would be a bourgeois "Holy Alliance" directed against Bolshevism, and then adds:

"I believe that Bolshevik Russia, if it is not crushed by the 'Holy Alliance' of my diplomat, will prepare for humanity the spectacle of a singular democracy such as the world will not have known until then, a democracy which will not be made up of gradual conquests plucked by shreds from a plutocratic bourgeoisie, but which will build itself up out of the very stuff of the people, a democracy which will not descend from the powerful ones to the people, as in all present forms of society, but which will rise voluntarily and surely from the unorganized and uncultivated folk to an organizing intelligence."

It is of course possible that the organizing intelligence will be supplied by the Bolsheviks themselves, but judging by the evidence of a witness as friendly as Arthur Ransome, there is ground for deep doubt. Mr. Ransome's book is a frank, attractively written, but unadorned record of interviews which he had in February, 1919, with important Russian commissars, and of personal impressions from which every reader is free to draw what inferences he pleases and in which every one will find proof to his purpose. Those whose faith is strong in the present leadership will point to the enthusiasm and devotion of the Bolshevik officials working under the most disheartening conditions and yet somehow keeping things going. Give them time, they may say, and a free hand, and they will be able to realize their grand schemes for social and industrial reorganization. Have they not begun at the right end by diffusing the means of education? Are there not more schools, more courses for workingmen, more universities, more libraries, than ever before? Have not the printing-presses been active in disseminating information and in republishing cheap editions of the classics? It is true that the children, after they reach school, sing the Marseillaise twice through, have dinner, and go home, but they are at least getting the habit of going to school. It is true that most of the new publication takes the form of partisan pamphleteering, but the printed word is being made more familiar to every Russian. There is no use in trying to discredit the educational work of the Bolsheviks. Their rivals can find more satisfaction in showing how the Bolsheviks have been betraying their most cherished principles. Everybody knows, for example, that they had their heart set on nationalizing the land, but the Commissar of Agriculture told Ransome that there was "no intention of any such idiocy as the attempt to force the peasants to give up private ownership." The Commissar of Labor explained in detail how they had been compelled to modify their ideas of factory control so that the technical expert and the works manager should no longer be at the mercy of a hastily called gathering of work-

men. The men whom we supposed fanatically devoted to a theory at times display an enormous practicality. "Soap is hard to get. Good. Establish a commission and soap instantly disappears. But put in one man to see that soap is forthcoming, and somehow or other we get it." These are the words not of some American business adviser but of the President of the Moscow Soviet. It is evidence of what M. Antonelli calls the flexibility of the Bolsheviks, and if only it created results it would be fatuous to cavil at it. But what is the actual condition to which Mr. Ransome bears witness? Physically the workmen are worse off than in 1912. Moscow is very cold and very hungry. Speculators are running wild, charging from five to a hundred times more for articles of food than the price fixed by the government. The value of money has disappeared. There is "very general and very bitter discontent."

But why does not this discontent take the form of an uprising against the government? Is it because the Bolsheviks have bloodily suppressed every symptom of opposition? Hardly. Mr. Ransome explains very lucidly the attitude of the various active groups hostile to the Bolsheviks. The Left Social Revolutionaries alone were reckless enough to carry on an agitation, but their program was something very like anarchy. There was both good sense and good humor in the sentence imposed upon their leader, Maria Spiridonova—confinement for a year in a home for neurasthenics. The Mensheviks would like to see capitalism restored as a preparation for their brand of socialism, but do not seem ready to assume the responsibility of governing. The Right Social Revolutionaries, who are the most likely claimants of the succession, still cling to their belief in the Constituent Assembly, but no longer seek to gain it by force. Apparently their hope is in the time when foreign interference shall cease and the Bolsheviks be called upon to face the problems of social and industrial organization on their merits. "Life itself," they say, "will compel the Bolsheviks to alter their policy or to go."

Mr. Davis directs the eyes of Americans toward the future promise of Russia. He points out the opportunities for industrial enterprise, describes the incalculable needs of that vast, economically lagging country, needs almost too obvious to call for detailed statement. Mr. Davis enumerates them all, from the electrification of samovars (a very happy thought!) to the installation of modern systems of water supply and the planning of great national parks. Verily, there is work enough in prospect for at least ten generations of Americans. But while emphasizing its economic backwardness, the writer has genuine appreciation for Russia's spiritual wealth and wisely warns his countrymen against an assumption of overweeningness in approaching a people among whom the feeling for beauty and for art is more finely developed and among whose educated circles intellectual standards are higher than they are in America. This is a truth upon which a steadily increasing number of observers is opening its astonished gaze.

JACOB ZEITLIN

## Scott Holland's Letters

*A Forty Years' Friendship, 1876-1917.* By Canon Ollard. London: Nisbet & Co.

THE late Canon Henry Scott Holland was doubtless the most vivid personality in the Church of England during the last quarter of a century; his death deprived the Establishment of a brilliant and vigorous preacher, and removed from the Regius professorship of Divinity its most illustrious occupant since James Bowling Mozley. In the Oxford of the middle seventies Scott Holland first became conspicuous as the most spirited member of a company of undonnish dons that included in its ranks such men as Paget, Moberly, Bright, Gore, and Aubrey Moore. Bishop Creighton once characterized the body of which he himself was so shining an ornament as "the church of sound

learning." Hardly ever, perhaps, in all its history has the description been so appropriate as in those days when, to mention men of very different ecclesiastical proclivities, Church and Liddon were in the full tide of their influence, and Hort and Hatch were by their exact and patient scholarship verifying anew the ancient saw, *stupor mundi clerus Anglicanus*. In 1879, when Scott Holland was appointed one of the Select Preachers before the university, the fame of his sermons had already spread throughout England. In 1884 Gladstone bestowed upon him a canonry at St. Paul's where he worked with earnest devotion for twenty-seven years, at the end of which Oxford recalled him to the Regius Chair of Divinity and a stall at Christ Church. The letters here collected, as the editor remarks, are primarily "a valuable contribution to the literature of which Mr. Gladstone is the centre"; appropriately enough they follow upon that earlier selection from Mrs. Drew's post-bag entitled "Some Hawarden Letters." These pages reflect the writer's joy in his membership of the Gladstone circle, his delight in his correspondent's letters and conversation, his unflinching zest for the fine things in books no less than in life, the exquisite, even tremulous, sympathy which he was ready to bestow upon all those with whom he came in contact, the amusing self-deprecation and self-abasement in which he loved to indulge, and the subtle and delightful perception of incongruities which constituted his humor.

Scattered throughout the book are many more or less Gladstonian judgments on literature. Henry James's "Madame de Mauves," Scott Holland remarks in an early letter, is "full of quiet interest and force: the situations he selects are exciting, but ugly; still the effect of that still, unflinching, uncomplaining endurance of the ignominious collapse of all ideal elements in life, without tragical defiance or rage, yet without any moral lowering or spiritual abandonment, in any violent despair or any fierce cynicism, in the face of all that is disgraceful and degrading and demoralizing, an endurance that can madden and kill that vile husband by its sheer force of domineering and lofty impenetrability—this as given in the quiet graceful figure of Mme. Mauves is wonderfully fine and novel and delicate . . . I wondered up to what level of power James could move—if he did so much strong work so lightly." In Meredith's "Diana" he is "caught wildly": "What a strange, studied, complicated, inward, subtle-mannered, outlandish, intense mind his is! He hammers out laboriously the most ravishing touches of flying character . . . he attracts and repels prodigiously. It is a very self-willed, self-concentrated sort of work: over-crammed with allusive suggestion of thoughts." He dislikes "A Modern Instance" and declares roundly: "How vulgar some American life is! How bare socially! Will you be indignant at my not liking it more?" Of Colvin's "Keats" he says most admirably in the very last letter: "The Life is fascinating for its reality, manliness, purity, nobility, and growth. I am delighted to find him so true to the immortal Wordsworth, who again comes out prophetically, with the deep-set eye of Ezekiel. The incomparable dinner at Haydon's when Lamb chaffed the stamp collector, is retold splendidly. Keats was growing on the very lines on which Shakespeare and Wordsworth grew, passing from idolatries of fancy and imagination to the deeper world of suffering humanity."

There are many amusing glimpses into the domestic workings of the Anglican system. We learn, for example, with what gentle insistence the wires were pulled—unsuccessfully—in aid of J. R. Illingworth's candidature for the chaplaincy of Lincoln's Inn. Scott Holland was frequently requested to recommend names for vacant benefices, "strangers who should turn out to be angels." Most of his candidates were reasonably angelic. There was the Rev. Augustus Legge, who not merely was married to a devoted church-woman, but was "full of persuasive goodness," was "a gentleman, kindly, pleasant, youngish yet staid. Not startling but very sure and true and sound and wise." There is also a Mr. Dunkerly, an ex-Wesleyan

preacher, who has "all the soul power of earnest dissent . . . He is great at Temperance," as one might expect, but "cannot build up the Holy Life quite so well." "Of course," Holland goes on to say, apparently in all seriousness, "he had better not go into a nest of gentlefolk—he would oppress the mild 'gentleman'—not violently, but still he might . . . he would talk more 'religion' than Society approves of, perhaps, etc. But I was quite assured that he would work upper shopkeepers well, as well—of course—as the poor."

Gladstone's name is rarely absent from these pages. Now Scott Holland is losing himself in an *O altitudo!* over the Prime Minister's Midlothian speeches in the autumn of 1884. Again in mock seriousness he is urging frantically that Gladstone should "move Stubbs or somebody to Exeter, and appoint himself Canon of St. Paul's. It would be a lovely way of retirement; so far better than the scandalous House of Lords. St. Ambrose was ordained Deacon, Priest, and Bishop in one day. There is the obvious precedent. It would be most beautiful, and he would be noble under the Dome. Then, if all went well, he must succeed to the Bishopric of London. It is too late for the Chair of Canterbury. The only problem is—who is to move the Queen in the business? . . . Think of the *Times*' article on the morning of the appointment!"

HENRY A. LAPPIN

## The Mighty Average

*Basil Everman.* By Elsie Singmaster. Houghton Mifflin Company.

*The Book of Marjorie.* Anonymous. Alfred A. Knopf.

*Fire of Youth.* By Henry James Forman. Little, Brown and Company.

*Possessed.* By Cleveland Moffett. The James A. McCann Company.

IF you dip into the broad stream of average American fiction your net will come up with a catch of amazing variety in form and color. So soon, however, as you begin to dissect, the impression of variety vanishes. Shape and tint are external; these creatures are built alike and function alike. There is but a single species. The philosopher may explain that inner uniformity; the reviewer is content to have ascertained its existence. These books, to speak plainly, are all didactic and they all teach the same thing. They counsel conformity to a static moral code and they do so honestly. But they are insistent rather than persuasive and noisy rather than fervent. Above all, they offer no new reasons for old truths. And the ability to do that is, in so changeful and tempestuous a world, the obvious test of a conservative's mental ability. Our novelists celebrate the rigor of the game, but their mere reiteration is but a feeble method for making it attractive.

Miss Elsie Singmaster has had her doubts. She has, also, a very sturdy little talent. But her publishers made a mistake when they suggested that "Basil Everman" is akin to the best novels that are now coming to us from England. That, unluckily, is just what it is not. The admirable virtue of the younger British novelists is their intellectual courage. They test all things to discover what really is good. Miss Singmaster gives us a warm and charming picture of her little college town; she catches the external characteristics and harmless little oddities of her people. But she will not let herself regard their real lives with a critical eye. Basil Everman, the dead hero of the story, "the marvellous boy who perished in his pride" and left a sheaf of immortal prose, comes out from the posthumous suspicions of the wicked critic not strong and impassioned and magnanimous, but only pure and clean and straight; the slim young Athena, Eleanor Brent, is no longer shocked by the slow tragedy of her mother's life and takes the desolation of her parents lightly when she learns that the two once went through the ceremony of marriage. Such hard selfishness and stupid formalism is common. But Miss Sing-

master seems to agree with Eleanor that desolate years and loss of hope and strength are tolerable if they are official. She pours scorn, on the other hand, on Mr. Utterly, who may have been blatant in manner but whose remarks were the commonplaces of civilized criticism. What she does well is the episode of Professor Scott and the ice-cream freezer. She should try to write a Pennsylvania "Cranford"; with the world of passions and ideas she simply has no contact.

"The Book of Marjorie" is a gentle autobiographical idyl, no less idyllic for having its scene in New York City. It is pleasant to know that these young people were so happy and that Marjorie's pangs when her little son was born increased the author's reverence for his own mother. One grows a trifle doubtful on learning what were the books that were "big moments" in Marjorie's life and that among the plays they saw "Dear Brutus" was certainly an exception." For one couples these facts with their tremendously earnest interest in golf and tennis and so adds them to a well-known type: people who are serious in matters of sport and silly in matters of the spirit, who can distinguish critically among tennis champions but neither among ideas nor artistic moods, who accept emotional posturing, so it be technically noble, and pinchbeck art, so it be properly optimistic, and whose ideal is the tinsel-garment and the gilded pill. So one is not surprised that the young father's hopes and plans for his little son's education are quite muddle-headed and include neither the item of intellectual rectitude nor that of a close contact with the historic culture of mankind. One can see little Peter grow up. He will have democratic manners. But will he be tolerant? He will act honestly. Will he take care first to think honestly? He will go through college. Will he know Horace and Swift and Goethe?

"Fire of Youth" is not a gentle book. There is a good deal of false briskness in it and a good deal of shabby sensuousness. But it is quite safe from moral or legal pursuit, since everything turns out straight and clean and pure, and since the wicked vampire, being a German, couldn't have been expected to be different anyhow. In the background there is a most attractive picture of Anthony West's father, which reminds one of William Allen White. But we leave this to follow the adventures of young Anthony in the wicked city. Here he forgets the sweetheart of his boyhood and meets the alluring Vilma, to whom he gives the family jewel. A pursuit of the jewel and a penitent return to Adela follow. The crudeness of the story lies in the fact that Anthony does not, as the publishers assert, "win through to a fine manhood." He wins through to nothing at all. His whole moral life is negative. He repudiates the fire of youth and through satiety and disgust regains his will to obedience under the social law. But his mind and character are what they were.

Mr. Moffett's "story about Penelope Wells, her waywardness, suffering, and regeneration in which is presented the truth about women that nobody tells" recalls not only through this legend on its "jacket" the story pamphlets once made notorious in our literature by the lurid minor works of the Rev. Mason Locke Weems. Weems also thundered against the lusts of the flesh. But he did not have Mr. Moffett's machinery of dual personality, literal possession by devils, Greenwich Village, and the war. Penelope's sex obsessions are like those of a monk in the Libyan desert. And like the monk she knows no mean between excess and abstention. It is at this point that the book, foolish and hectic as it is, illustrates the spirit and attitude that are so hostile to the development of the serious novel. There is, in all these average novels, no attempt to understand life or to master it. There are no categories but good and evil; the chasm between them is the same as it was in the eyes of Augustine. There is no *via media* of moral salvation. The Penelopes are all either abandoned or cloistral, precisely as in the minds of many worthy Americans there are but two attitudes to wine—flat on the bar-room floor or erect in the Prohibition pulpit.

## Notes and News

To judge by the first number of the *Freeman* the new weekly is to sweeten radicalism with wit and irony until the mixture will be irresistible by any but that "camorra of right-thinking profiteers" (in Mr. Mencken's phrase) who cling to conservative dullness wherever it can find a printer. The reactionaries do not know what they are about, or they would discard the stone bludgeon, which appears to be their only weapon, for the neater snickersnee of ridicule, which has always been the natural instrument of their tribe against the impudent heads bobbing radically up here or there. But you cannot teach our reactionaries. That, of course, is the thing which keeps them what they are.

The *Socialist Review* has now made four monthly appearances since it succeeded the quarterly *Intercollegiate Socialist* and became a general review of Socialist affairs. Though very serious, it is also sane; though devoted solely to Socialist concerns, it devotes to them a wide range of interest and knowledge. We do not know where else in America the progress of Socialist doctrines may be studied to better effect.

The critical spirit of France is recovering the strength and resuming the organs of publication which it had before the war. Under the editorship of Jacques Rivière the *Nouvelle Revue Française* has appeared again after five years' silence. Its old preoccupation with art and literature in their purest form is less marked, and the editors are at times fiercely political. Another periodical which has been revived is the *Revue Critique des Idées et des Livres*, less political than formerly, but still warring on romanticism in every form. Of its earlier staff and contributors twenty, including Pierre Gilbert their leader, were killed. A review which did striking work before 1914, the *Phalange*, will not be revived. Two new reviews are announced for the spring. One is the *Revue Universelle*, organ of the Parti de l'Intelligence, which has been founded in opposition to the Clarté group of Romain Rolland, Henri Barbusse, Georges Duhamel, and Pierre Hamp. The Parti de l'Intelligence includes most of the monarchists formerly of the *Action Française*, but also various writers who contrive to be patriots without being royalists. The Parti de l'Intelligence will give themselves to propaganda for French national ideas at home and, somewhat paradoxically, abroad. In this manner Prohibitionists and Bolsheviks do missionary work in all directions. The *Revue de Genève*, to be edited by Robert de Traz, will aim to present a general picture of the intellectual Europe of our day.

CASTOR and Pollux are out again; that is, H. L. Mencken and George Jean Nathan have collaborated in "The American Credo," and appear in the agreeable black-and-gold habiliments for which Alfred A. Knopf deserves credit. The creed of Mr. Mencken and Mr. Nathan is given in a huge preface, which says that the American mob is a mob like other mobs, that it is not always actuated by the idealisms which its leaders utter and promulgate, and that it holds a large number of opinions which would be interesting if true. As Mr. Mencken and Mr. Nathan think these opinions are interesting because they are not true, the "Credo" is made up of a long and amusing and jolting list of wrong things that Americans believe. Many of these beliefs are simply generalizations to which exceptions may be taken, though at ground they are true enough. The business of this Castor and Pollux is taking exceptions. Many of the beliefs are absurd and nothing else. It was a good idea to set them forth. Sir Thomas Browne did the same trick for the seventeenth century in his "Pseudodoxia Epidemica, or Enquiries Into Very Many Received Tenets and Commonly Presumed Truths, Which Examined Prove but Vulgar and Common Errors."

## Drama

## The Life and Death of Richard III

FROM the third part of "King Henry VI" and from "King Richard III" a skilled and sensitive hand has shaped a biographical play in three acts and sixteen scenes concerning the life and death of Richard of Gloucester. For this drama Mr. Robert Edmond Jones has built scenery of a dark and naked magnificence. His Tower of London blends the architectural reality with all one's imaginative visions of a harsh, bloody, and turbulent age. The throne room is rich and beautiful, but its very lines and patterns accord with the swift and cruel fate of these transitory kings.

Through these scenes John Barrymore, clad in varying bursts of color, limps as Richard of Gloucester—slow, sinister, almost feeble, hiding yet accentuating the deformities that have so wrought upon his soul. He wears an orange doublet that glows more brilliantly for the glossy sable of his hose; wrapped in a scarlet cloak he sits on a white horse between the dark robes of a cardinal and the gray wall of the Tower; he flashes in a suit of golden armor. His face is like a dagger—now glittering, now dull. It sheathes its malevolence or strikes out. But there is this strange and unearthly thing about its temper: it breaks but it does not melt. The art of Mr. Barrymore, which is eager and self-conscious and flexible, has not been able to mold into the flowing curves of life the rigid mediæval psychology of his hero. He has striven toward that end, but the result is only a gorgeous artifice.

He begins upon a note of tragic self-pity:

Then, since the heavens have shaped my body so,

Let hell make crook'd my mind to answer it.

It is, in his rendering, the cry of a wounded spirit that would,

like his Gianetto in Benelli's "Jest," build a protective armor about its own infirmity—there more of craft, here of ruthlessness. And he lets Richard rise to a very modern cry of self-justification in the words "I am myself alone." But at once this interpretation conflicts with the mediæval ethical conventions of the Shakespeare of 1593. A cripple stung to monstrous deeds by his own sensitiveness would be aware of his own inner qualities; his conflict would not have left him without a presentiment of the relative aspect of the moral life. Shakespeare, of course, cared little for that. Richard is villain through and through. He knows that the murdered Edward was a good man and that he is a plain doer of evil "whose all not equals Edward's moiety." He does not play with shadings or excuses. So Mr. Barrymore, to give continuity to his conception, lends Richard a mordant and cynical humor in whose very wildness and excess there is a hint of the old pain. And the text does, indeed, fully bear out the sinister humor, as in Gloucester's

Cannot a plain man live and think no harm?

or in his swift baiting of Margaret, or in the answer to his mother's question "Art thou my son?"

Ay, I thank God, my father, and yourself.

But in the text this humor is like the sparks struck from a flint; it neither hides nor betrays a malady of the soul. It is part of what Richard himself calls his "naked villany" which, for mere effectiveness, he clothes

With old, odd ends stolen out of holy writ.

Throughout the whole of what is, in this representation, the third act, Mr. Barrymore lets Richard show a disintegration of the spirit that is expressed by a growing feebleness and feverishness of speech and bodily gesture. It was, obviously, his only refuge from his author. For again the text plays him false. Richard is broken by danger from without and by defeat in the field. The ghosts of his murdered men and women are ghosts risen from a mediæval purgatory to blast and damn him. They

ALFRED A. KNOPF



220 W. 42d ST., NEW YORK

has published since January 1st

## Fiction

**THE SECRET BATTLE.** By A. P. Herbert.

The critics have been unanimous in their praise of this great story. "Marks a welcome, fresh accession to the ranks of the really notable novelists."—*New York Times*. \$2.00.

**WHERE ANGELS FEAR TO TREAD.** By

E. M. Forster. A delightful novel of England and Italy, satirical yet truthful, that should appeal especially to *Nation* readers. \$2.00.

**DELIVERANCE.** By E. L. Grant Watson. A

story of spiritual emancipation by the author of *Where Bonds Are Loosed*. \$2.00.

**THE ROLLING STONE.** By C. A. Dawson-

Scott. The story of an unconventional hero. "Admirably written. It possesses genuine dramatic power, distinction."—*New York Times*. \$2.00.

**THE TALLEYRAND MAXIM.** By J. S.

Fletcher. A first-class detective yarn by the author of *The Middle Temple Murder*. \$1.90.

**THE CROSS PULL.** By Hal G. Everts. An

exciting tale of the western wilds, with a wolf-dog for its hero. \$1.90.

## Poetry, Drama

**THE QUEEN OF CHINA and Other**

Poems. By Edward Shanks. Awarded the English Hawthornden prize for the best imaginative work of the year by a man under forty. \$2.00.

**ARGONAUT AND JUGGERNAUT.** By Os-

bert Sitwell. These poems of revolt have the spirit of the new world-order. \$1.50.

**POEMS.** By T. S. Eliot. The first published collection in this country of Mr. Eliot's fresh and unusual verse. \$1.25.

**RIP VAN WINKLE.** By Percy MacKaye. The book of de Koven's opera. \$1.50.

**SOPHIE.** By Philip Moeller. Emily Stevens is now playing in the title rôle of this sparkling comedy. \$1.75.

## Politics, Biography

**BOLSHEVIK RUSSIA.** By Etienne Antonelli.

The best book on Russia for the layman, since it covers all essential points of Bolshevik theory and practice without prejudice, and with the sole purpose of presenting the facts. \$2.50.

**HOW THE WAR CAME.** By the Earl Lore-

burn. "An unequivocal denunciation of the old order of secret diplomacy tending to involve this country in war with Mexico. Includes summaries of Mexican arts, sciences, politics, etc. \$2.00.

**THE PLOT AGAINST MEXICO.** By L. J.

de Bekker. A timely warning for all Americans against the insidious propaganda tending to involve this country in war with Mexico. Includes summaries of Mexican arts, sciences, politics, etc. \$2.00.

**THE LIFE OF FRANCIS PLACE.** By Gra-

ham Wallis. The story of the "radical tailor of Charing Cross," the father of the English labor movement. "A masterpiece of the biographer's art."—*New York Tribune*. With portrait frontispiece. \$3.50.

## Belles-Lettres

**OLD JUNK.** By H. M. Tomlinson. Pictures of sea and land, of Africa, France, England—by the master of a remarkable prose style. \$2.00.

**THE ANTICHRIST.** By F. W. Nietzsche. A brilliant translation from the German with an Introduction by H. L. Mencken. \$1.75.

**WE MODERNS.** By Edwin Muir. An original and penetrating criticism of the modern spirit. Introduction by H. L. Mencken. \$1.75.

**IN THE GARRET.** By Carl Van Vechten.

Charming and informing essays on the theatre and literature. "Mr. Van Vechten's most spontaneous and engaging writing."—*New York Globe*. \$2.00.

**THE AMERICAN CREDO.** By George Jean

Nathan and H. L. Mencken. A devastating satire dissecting the American mob-mind. "Probably the most extraordinary and important work of these gifted, brilliant, and indefatigable critics."—*Chicago Tribune*. \$1.75.

**A BOOK OF BURLESQUES.** By H. L. Men-

cken. Satires and extravagances in the best Mencken manner. \$2.00.

**THE BOOK OF MARJORIE.** A new "American Idyll" is this intimate story of the author's love and marriage, and the birth of his first child. \$1.50.

## Theosophy

**SIX THEOSOPHIC POINTS.** By Jacob

Böhme. With "Other Writings," "explaining all the Earthly and Heavenly Mysteries." \$3.00.

are not the crystallization of a long and suppressed spiritual agony. They do not symbolize his conscience; they awaken it. Mr. Barrymore's Richard has a tragedy of the inner life; Shakespeare's chronicle illustrates the fact that even the cleverest and strongest scoundrel is punished in the end. In the tent scene on Bosworth field Mr. Barrymore has a rich and resonant moment in the awakening from that fearful sleep. But in this very moment he is forced to belie his own conception wholly. For his Richard, stung to excess and crime by the bitterness of fate, would have found pity for himself within himself; his conscience would have used those "several thousand tongues" before, or else he would have sought to transcend it and would have hurled his defiance against the very ministers of doom. The mediæval villain, having determined upon his course, dispensed with conscience until hell and vengeance found him out. Not a mediæval villain of flesh and blood, of course, who being human was divided and tormented, but the villain of the mediæval Christian tradition whom the young Shakespeare accepted in all but the customary inhumanity and in the customary unashamed homiletic intention.

The performance, despite the discrepancy between its own central motivation and the Shakespearean text, is an arresting and even a fascinating one. But it is not really great. Mr. Barrymore has moments of the highest histrionic effectiveness; he allures and dazzles. But the word histrionic with all its connotations stands between him and the spirit from which greatness issues. He misses here, as he missed in Tolstoi's "Redemption," the note of an ultimate sincerity. He does not lose himself; he is not consumed in the flame of his own creative imagination. We watch John Barrymore doing marvellous things, and he watches himself with an eager appreciation and applause. He permits himself to be surrounded, notably here, by large companies of very inferior actors who play in subdued tones, raise his personality into an immoderate relief, and shatter the drama which he feigns to interpret. One quality only his Richard adds to those with which we are already familiar in him. His diction is wholly beautiful—clear, scholarly, and eloquent. He has, evidently, the finest rhythmic sense. The verses of "Richard III" do not yet flow in massive and interlinked paragraphs as in the later Shakespeare. Many of them are end-stopped and so a little hard and stiff. Mr. Barrymore observes the versification very scrupulously and yet wrings from the lines their utmost of musical value. As a declamation, in the best sense, his performance is therefore beyond praise. As acting, it suffers from a display of personal idiosyncrasy and untempered power.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

## Art Painting and the Painter

*Painting and the Personal Equation.* By Charles H. Woodbury, N.A. Houghton Mifflin Company.

IN discussing a book so rich in aphorisms as this new one of Mr. Woodbury's, the reviewer is put at hard labor to keep his quotations from it within manageable limits. Mr. Woodbury presents old principles with such freshness, he is gnomic with such a wealth of paradox and whimsy, that passage after passage fairly shrieks to be quoted. The volume is the outgrowth of a series of lectures delivered to a summer class in landscape painting. The members of the class surely had an enviable time listening to these lectures; although those students who expected a bag of studio tricks to be poured in their laps may have been bewildered. The style suggests Whistler's "Ten O'Clock." The sentence as the unit of structure, however, is not pushed to the same degree of isolation as in the "Ten O'Clock"; but certainly Mr. Woodbury's congeries of sparkling remarks tends in the same direction—toward a confused impression, a loss of collective effect. The subject matter is addressed to The Painter, The Student, and The Public. The bulk of the volume, of course, con-

### CARLTON H. PARKER'S

#### *The Casual Laborer (and Other Essays)*

With an Introduction by CORNELIA STRATTON PARKER, author of *AN AMERICAN IDYLL*; "Toward Understanding Labor Unrest"; "The Casual Laborer"; "The I. W. W."; and "Motives in Economic Life." *Just ready, \$2.00 net.*

### EDWARD CARPENTER'S

#### *Pagan and Christian Creeds*

The author of "Towards Democracy," etc., writes a fascinating volume concerning the origin of religious rites and ceremonies, and brings the pagan and Christian cults in line with each other. *Just ready, \$3.00*

### J. A. HOBSON'S

#### *Taxation in the New State*

The author of "The Science of Wealth," etc., sets forth a constructive program for the reform of taxation without injurious effects on industry and livelihood. *Just ready, \$1.75*

### RALPH ALBERTSON'S

#### *Fighting Without a War*

A vivid first-hand account of the Allied Expedition at the Archangel front, a surprising revelation to most Americans. *Just ready, \$1.50*

### W. E. B. DuBOIS'

#### *Darkwater*

A remarkable companion volume to the author's "The Souls of Black Folk," by the chief spokesman of the 200,000,000 men and women of African blood. *Just ready, \$2.00*

### JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES'

#### *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*

"Will compel the attention of the world."—Frank A. Vanderlip in *Chicago Daily News*. *6th large printing, \$2.50 net.*

### WALTER LIPPMANN'S

#### *Liberty and the News*

It is foolish to look through a glass darkly, but it is criminal to darken the glass. Suppose the glass to be your daily paper— *Just ready, \$1.00*

### R. F. ALFRED HOERNLÉ'S

#### *Studies in Contemporary Metaphysics*

A volume of systematic and constructive studies by an Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Harvard. *Just ready, \$3.00 net.*

### MARY WHITE O'VINGTON'S

#### *The Shadow*

A sane, sympathetic, and unfailingly interesting novel of northerner and southerner, black and white. *Just ready, \$2.00*

### HARCOURT, BRACE & HOWE

1 West 47th St., New York

cerns itself with the student and his problem as a beginner in the painting of landscape.

As the title "Painting and the Personal Equation" suggests, the book stresses the psychological factor in painting, and one is prepared for the remark that "Realism has never been more than an individual opinion held in the delusive name of truth." This remark goes to the heart of the main point in the book. "The important thing is the acceptance on your part of the thought that all visual impressions are a result, partly of the physical conditions of Nature and partly of your own mentality. This is an attitude that should be back of every conscious thought; it will lead you to see continuity and relation wherever the eyes rest." Again: "The world is objective to us only at the point where our eyes and mind touch it. There thought and sight combine. All else becomes general and subjective, to be arranged, however, as soon as the eye passes to another object." Mr. Woodbury takes the accepted fact of our "seeing" and shows it to us in all its perplexing untrustworthiness; he is as interesting and suggestive here in discussing the more specialized artistic problem of knowledge as is Bertram Russell in discussing the problem of knowledge from the larger philosophical point of view. If the public had Mr. Woodbury's principle well established in its mind, a painter could see a blue horse to his heart's content without having his sanity questioned. Painting never has as its object the imitation of Nature. The artist paints the effect that Nature has on him, "the causes so far as we can analyze them." This is not the same thing as attempting to paint the mental condition itself which results from the causes. "Some of our prophets," he says, attempt this; "it is a brilliant idea, and certainly can be carried out. But it assumes an interest in one's private affairs that seems in no way warranted by experience." The Modernists come in again occasionally for adverse criticism, but they are treated in no spirit of deliberate unfairness. The underlying fallacy of pseudo-Primitive theory is well explained.

The most helpful advice that Mr. Woodbury gives to the student is contained in the following: "We should say to ourselves kindly but firmly, 'this thing that I see gives me a definite impression which comes from the relation of a few large tones.' Establish the sky in its general color and then the other important masses in their relations to it, and stop to check up the result before any great changes occur." The author has nothing pontifical to say about drawing, color, or composition. Drawing is suggestion—implying more than one puts down. Color is relation—to imitate each color for itself is to fail ignominiously. Composition that one carefully calculates by an ingenious scale set like a trap, results in "stuffed art." The rules of composition are all too few, for one needs a new rule for each picture. In his comments on the "center of interest" and emphasis in a picture Mr. Woodbury is especially suggestive. In a highly finished canvas all the facts have equal value, and we have "a catalogue when we expected a story or at least a brilliant remark." "A completely realized picture is canned emotion."

The brief sections of the book which are addressed to The Painter and The Public set forth clearly the grounds of mis-

understanding between them, but suggests no immediate method of settling the dust of prejudice and ignorance that clouds the eyes of both alike. Doubtless there exists no immediate method. In the painter's work the public looks first for the obvious subject-interest. Now, subject divides itself into two classes. In one we have a story more or less definitely told, with the chief interest in the represented objects. "In the other, color, light, and form are associated to create a primary sensation that can be duplicated neither in words nor in music." For the public to understand this more abstract side of painting generally requires some training. But to understand and like the transparent story-telling or anecdote picture is something. The bad pictures are often stepping stones to higher things in art. Fine private collections have begun with meretricious canvases. The painter, on the other hand, is likely to scoff at the desperate self-assertion of the uncultivated but honest person who says "I know nothing of art but I know what I like." The author of this book has little use for the painter who takes himself too seriously, and fails to recognize public responsibility. "We need only think of how long his sort has lasted." This large social aspect of the artist is summed up in the following: "In the long run the work that the painter leaves behind him lives or dies in proportion to its value to others. He feeds the growing world with his accomplishment. He may be like yesterday's dinner, with identity lost, but having made his contribution to the general support. Perhaps he is more permanent food and reaches to the life-current itself. But whether he be as a green apple or a draught of æsthetic wine, he disappears as an individual. A drop of acid in a tub of brine modifies the brine, but, after all, does it matter in the result who put it there? . . . individualism, whether in the person or in the nation, has been left behind . . . the creative man is personal, and at the same time impersonal, having all the needs of other men, but in his sum merely a working unit in the scheme of the whole. It is a nice balance between a man and a cause. This is the professional painter of the first profession in the world."

GLEN MULLIN

Whatever book you want

*Wanamaker's*

has it, or will get it

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books  
NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

## Diplomacy and the Study of International Relations

By D. P. HEATLEY

Net \$3.75

An attempt to portray diplomacy and the conduct of foreign policy from the standpoint of history. In the history of diplomacy we see the fruit for each age in treaties which express the movements of thought and mark the development of convictions that are widely recognized.

## The Mechanism of Exchange

*A Handbook of Currency, Banking and Trade in Peace and War*

By J. A. TODD

Net \$3.75

This book can be profitably studied by everyone who has to do with either sale or purchase of foreign goods. The factors which control foreign exchanges are clearly explained and enable the business man to carefully judge the direction and extent of their trend.

At all booksellers or  
from the publishers

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch  
35 West 32nd Street  
New York

# International Relations Section

## Contents

|                                             |     |
|---------------------------------------------|-----|
| AUSTRIA'S IRREDENTA—SOUTH TYROL             |     |
| I. South Tyrol and the Fourteen Points..... | 406 |
| II. The Treaty Provisions .....             | 406 |
| III. The Italian Memorandum .....           | 406 |
| IV. The Tyrolese Memorandum .....           | 406 |
| V. President Wilson's Decision .....        | 408 |
| VI. The Austrian Protest .....              | 408 |
| VII. Lord Bryce on the Tyrol Decision.....  | 409 |
| VIII. The Census Figures .....              | 410 |
| EVENTS OF THE WEEK.....                     | 410 |

## I. South Tyrol and the Fourteen Points

**A** READJUSTMENT of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.—*President Wilson, January 8, 1918.*

## II. The Treaty Provisions

**T**HE secret treaty concluded at London on April 26, 1915, by which Great Britain, France, and Russia accepted the terms demanded by Italy as the price of its participation in the war, included the following provision:

IV. By the future treaty of peace Italy shall receive: the Trentino; the whole of southern Tyrol, as far as its natural and geographical frontier, the Brenner; the city of Trieste and its surroundings; the county of Gorizia and Gradisca; the whole of Istria as far as the Quarnero, including Volosca and the Istrian Islands, Cherso and Lussin, as also the lesser islands of Plavnik, Unia, Canidoli, Paluzzuola, S. Pietro Nerovio, Asinello, and Gruica, with their neighboring islets.

NOTE 1. In carrying out what is said in Article IV the frontier line shall be drawn along the following points: from the summit of Umbrile northwards to the Stelvio, then along the watershed of the Rhaetian Alps as far as the sources of the rivers Adige and Eisack, then across the Mounts Reschen and Brenner and the Oetz and Ziller peaks. The frontier then turns southwards, touching Mount Toblach, in order to reach the present frontier of Carniola, which is near the Alps. Along this frontier the line will reach Mount Tarvis and will follow the watershed of the Julian Alps beyond the crests of Predil, Mangart, and Tricorno, and the passes of Podberdo, Podlansko, and Idria. From here the line will run in a southeast direction towards the Schneeberg, in such a way as not to include the basin of the Save and its tributaries in Italian territory. From the Schneeberg the frontier will descend towards the sea coast, including Castua, Matuglia, and Volosca as Italian districts.

The official summary of the conditions of peace presented to the Austrian plenipotentiaries at St. Germain-en-Laye, June 2, 1919, included the following statement:

The frontier with Italy begins at the Reschen Pass on the Swiss frontier and follows in general the watershed between the basins of the Inn and the Drave on the north and the Adige, Piave, and Tagliamento on the south. This line, which runs through the Brenner Pass and the peak of Tre Signori (Dreiherrenspitze) includes in the Italian frontiers the valley of Sexten and the basin of Tarvis. [This frontier is virtually identical with that drawn in the secret treaty of London, except that it includes within the Italian frontier the valley of Sexten, on the other side of the watershed.]

## III. The Italian Memorandum

**T**HE following passages are taken from a memorandum prepared by the Italian Government shortly after the armistice, and handed to President Wilson in March, 1919.

A mere glance at any contour map shows what the northeast frontier of Italy should be. The high mountains of the Oetz, Stubai, and Ziller valleys and of the High Tauer (Gross Venediger, Grossglockner, Hochnarr, Ankogel) rise sharply out of the Alps, and together form a clearly marked line, which separates the mountains of the Trentino and Kärnten from those of the Vorarlberg and Salzburg. It is a mighty barrier, about 250 kilometers long. . . . The line of the Noric Alps would correspond exactly to the necessities of the case did not other considerations lead Italy to moderate her military aspirations so that the border, instead of following the desired line throughout, should turn to the south from the Dreiherrenspitze (Ziller valley group), running to the Hochgall and passing over the peaks of the Kreuzspitze and of the Hochhornspitze to the Carnic Alps, including the mountain range which dominates the Sexten valley.

We can establish that the Brenner frontier [that just outlined] has the following advantages:

1. That it corresponds to a definite geographic formation, which interposes as a separative element between the lives of the neighboring peoples;

2. That it winds almost its entire course on impassible terrain, which forms a natural barrier and makes a defense possible with little labor and small forces;

3. That it provides excellent communications with the hinterland and enables rapid disposition of troops from both sides to menaced positions. It is therefore the ideal frontier between two peoples because it is equally just to them in all matters. . . .

The only possible objection to the Brenner frontier is that it includes the German inhabitants of the upper Etsch valley. Not less than 200,000 Germans lived south of the Brenner before the war. It should, however, be noted that:

1. Necessarily there is always a mixture of nationalities in a frontier region, because of the unavoidable relations between neighboring peoples;

2. Not to mention the historical facts which bind Meran, Brixen, and Bozen to Italy, it is impossible to overlook the fact that all hostile invasions have been from the north toward the south and that the element of German origin which lives south of the Brenner is therefore the fruit of a real importation into the Ladin region.

3. There are also numerous elements of Italian origin living among Germans far from their fatherland, but the Italians do not therefore consider annexing the territories which they inhabit.

Furthermore there is nothing in this question worthy of discussion: a nation has the right to the frontiers which nature has clearly indicated for her. If elements of foreign nationality live within these limits, it is natural that they must become assimilated. . . .

## IV. The Tyrolese Memorandum

**T**HE following memorandum, submitted to President Wilson by the "Government of Tyrol," supports the claim to self-determination of the district of south Tyrol.

Point nine of the fourteen points of President Wilson speaks of an adjustment of the Italian frontier on clearly recognizable national lines. The demand of the Italians to get possession of German south Tyrol as far as the Brenner and the Toblacher Feld, means an extension of the frontier far beyond these clearly

recognizable national lines, and is nothing but an imperialistic annexation of purely German territory.

In Tyrol (south of the Brenner) the German- and the Italian-speaking districts are separated from each other by a very distinct natural barrier. The language frontier runs almost entirely along high and almost impassable mountain ridges, traverses the valleys at places where there are defiles and gullies, and divides a virtually purely German population and country in the north, from a virtually purely Italian population and country in the south. Commencing at the Zufallspitze (Cevendale Peak) in the Ortler group, the ridge of the Alps forms the boundary, first between the Vintschgau in the north, the Sulzberg and the Nonsberg in the south, as far as the Gantkofel, then, towards the south, as far as the Salurn ravine. In this ravine, the language border crosses the valley of the Etsch, between Salurn and Mezzolombardo, ascends immediately to the mountain ridge between the Etsch valley and the Fleims valley, and joins at the end the German-Ladinian language border at the Latemarstock. North of this natural border, there are only two parishes with an Italian majority, *viz.*, Pfatten and Branzoll, which, south of Bozen, form an Italian language island. According to the census of 1910, there are there 1,011 Italians to 823 Germans. It must also be borne in mind, that the Italians of this language island are not bound to the soil, but are partly woodcutters and raftsmen, partly tenants of a certain lot of newly domiciled Italian landed proprietors.

As to the rest, in the valley of the river Etsch, southwards from Bozen, right down to the language border, there are only small Italian minorities in several parishes and court circuits; even in the parish of Salurn, which is in the immediate vicinity of the language border, the Italian minority in 1910 was only 19 per cent. of the inhabitants of the parish. In the most southerly court circuit of the German-speaking districts, in the court circuit of Neumarkt, to which Pfatten and Branzoll belong, there are 12 Italians to every 100 Germans. In the court circuit of Kaltern and in the town of Bozen, inhabited mainly by the working classes, there are only 5 Italians. The Italian minorities to the north of Bozen are of no importance whatever. In the court circuits of Schlanders, Glurns, Sarntal, Klausen, Sterzing, and Taufers, the Italians number less than 50. And the Italians in the German-speaking districts north of Bozen are not bound to the soil, but are mostly an unsettled and changing population of workmen, day laborers, and domestic servants.

Southwards from the natural border between the German and the Italian-speaking districts, there are 4 German parishes in Upper Nonsberg, (Laurein with 487 Germans and 2 Italians; Proveis with 374 Germans and 10 Italians; St. Felix with 275 Germans and 8 Italians; Unsere liebe Frau im Walde with a purely German population). The territory of these parishes is, by means of the deep incuttings of the mountain ridges, in immediate connection with the German-speaking district. The same applies to the parishes of Altrei and Truden, which are also situated south of the border described above in the Fleimstal (Val di Fiemme), which, together, have a population of 1,011 Germans, and only 34 Italians. Also these parishes form a part of the German-speaking district with which they are connected, by the Pass of Kaltenbrunn.

Of the whilom numerous German-speaking islands south of the border of the compact German-speaking district, there remain today only the German parishes in the Fersental and Luserna (south of the Valsugana). These parishes number, all in all, 2,378 Germans and 249 Italians.

Should the frontier posts between Italy and German Tyrol be shifted back to the border of the compact German-speaking district, we should find the population composed as follows:

|                                                                | Germans | Italians | Ladins         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------|----------------|
| German south Tyrol (including the political district of Lienz) | 247,988 | 7,100    | (about) 19,000 |

The demarcation "along clearly recognizable lines of nationality" in south Tyrol is perhaps more clearly drawn by nature than in any other land. It can be so arranged that only a very

small part of the German or the Italian people would come under a foreign yoke. The nature of this boundary would afford Italy any military security it might with justice demand. . . . Never in the course of history did the Brenner and the middle ridge of the Alps form the Italian frontier, and never were they a separating barrier between nations. In the sixth century, the Bavarians, a German tribe, invaded the eastern Alps, and in the same century occupied Tyrol up to and including Bozen. The Bavarian occupation has therefore lasted more than thirteen centuries. . . .

For many centuries German has been the language of the law courts, of the churches, and of the schools in German south Tyrol. . . .

Politically, in the Middle Ages, the whole of German south Tyrol belonged to the Duchy of Bavaria, and so to the German Empire (the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation of the middle ages). It remained part of it till the breaking up of the old German Empire. When the German Confederation took the place of the latter in 1815, Tyrol formed a part of this Confederation till Austria broke away therefrom in 1866. Tyrol came under the sway of the Hapsburgs in the year 1363. Nevertheless, this country, thanks to its remarkable geographical position, to its old recognized rights and peculiarity, and to the independent ways of its inhabitants, occupied a more independent position, compared with the other Austrian lands. Also when the Pragmatic Sanction was drawn up, which guaranteed the indivisibility of the lands ruled over by the Hapsburgs, the Tyrolese Diet, as a party to the contract, was able to secure for itself the same privileges as the dynasty. It was only after the Austrian Government became strong and centralized in Vienna (in the second half of the eighteenth century) that it tried, in spite of the opposition of Tyrol, to deprive the latter country of its privileges. . . .

The Italian peasant is quite different. His economic condition is quite different from that of the German peasant. Instead of a compact farm belonging to him, instead of the well-kept farmyards of German Tyrol, there is a general dividing up of the soil, according to no plan whatever. As a rule the peasant is not the owner of the land, but the tenant of a landed proprietor. The conditions of the lease are very unfavorable, and the life of the farmers is correspondingly hard. It would be the same in German Tyrol if it came under Italian sway bringing with it the same rural conditions which now prevail in Italian Tyrol. . . .

Should a tyrannical decision of foreign statesmen decree that part of Tyrol must be torn away, then what remains will be condemned to starve and wither. A whole people, a united land, little though it be, which has for a thousand years gloriously upheld its name and freedom will disappear from the pages of history.

The Germans and the Ladinians of south Tyrol ask nothing more than the right of self-determination, which President Wilson wishes to make the basis of peace. The German and Ladinic population of south Tyrol should get an opportunity to voice their own opinion. Only those who lived there before the war should have the right to vote. The voting, to be free, must be carried out under neutral control or under the control of American commissioners. It must be free from the pressure of the Italian occupation authorities. Also those Tyrolese who are at present prisoners of war must be given the opportunity to vote.

Tyrol and its whole German population confidently lay their future in the hands of the President of the United States of America, assured that a solemn word spoken by him has guaranteed them their greatest good, that is, the freedom of their country and the unity of their people.

The Government of Tyrol:

SCHRAFFL, Governor

PAUL F. VON STERNBACH, First Vice-Governor

DR. GRUENER, Second Vice-Governor

DR. KARL PUSCH, Third Vice-Governor

## V. President Wilson's Decision

**I**N the course of the statement issued by President Wilson on April 29, 1919, explaining the stand which he had taken in the Fiume matter a fortnight earlier, the following passage occurs:

Throughout my consideration of it [the question of Italian claims], however, I have felt that there was one matter in which I had no choice and could wish to have none. I felt bound to square every conclusion that I should reach as accurately as possible with the fourteen principles of peace which I set forth in my address to the Congress of the United States on the 8th of January, 1918, and in subsequent addresses. These fourteen points and the principles laid down in the subsequent addresses were formally adopted with only a single reservation by the Powers associated against Germany and will constitute the basis of peace with Germany. I do not feel at liberty to suggest one basis of peace with Germany and another for peace with Austria.

Personally I am quite willing that Italy should be accorded along the whole front of her northern frontier, and wherever she comes into contact with Austrian territory, all that was accorded her in the so-called Pact of London, but I am of the clear opinion that the Pact of London can no longer apply to the settlement of her eastern boundaries.

The line drawn in the Pact of London was conceived for the purpose of establishing an absolutely adequate frontier of safety for Italy against any possible hostility or aggression on the part of Austria. But Austria-Hungary no longer exists. These eastern frontiers will touch countries stripped of the military and naval power of Austria, set up in entire independence of Austria, and organized for the purpose of satisfying legitimate national aspirations, and so-called states not hostile to the new European order, but arising out of it, interested in its maintenance, dependent upon the cultivation of friendships, and bound to a common policy of peace and accommodation by the covenant of the League of Nations.

## VI. The Austrian Protest

**T**HE Austrian Government replied on August 6 to the conditions of peace handed to the Austrian delegation at St. Germain on June 2 and July 20. The following paragraphs are taken from this reply.

The mountain people of Tyrol put full confidence in the victorious Powers, and believed that it had placed its fate and future in the hands of just judges. And now Tyrol, which hitherto has been counted, next to Switzerland, as the very home of freedom and of opposition to every tyranny, is to be sacrificed to strategic considerations, offered up to militarism!

So this is to be the outcome of a war which was undertaken to protect Right and Justice? And this germ of corroding bitterness, which is to be planted in the heart of Europe, is to usher in a just and permanent peace? What cruel and tragic irony!

Austria has done everything to prove that the freedom and unity of Tyrol is in law and in fact an elementary demand of justice as well as of economic and practical life. How could the language frontier which separates Tyrol from the Trentino, that frontier so clearly marked even in geographic formation, how could this frontier have been maintained almost without change for so many centuries if it had not corresponded exactly to the needs of the population and the demands of daily life? Italy's territorial claims, moreover, have steadily increased. The frontiers which Italy asks, in the present treaty, cross the watershed and pass beyond the territory which was envisaged in the Pact of London and which formed the Armistice Zone. According to the peace treaty the

Sexten valley is now to be added too, although it was never before menaced with subjection. As little consideration is given the will of the people and its right to freedom in these claims as to the repeated request, fully worked out in the form of a draft treaty, to neutralize Tyrol, and, by the intervention and supervision of the great Powers, including Italy, to render impossible any military advance or any measure which could have the remotest connection with military purposes.

German Tyrol requires freedom and unity within the boundaries which Nature has given it in order to live, and in order to avoid a catastrophe into which it would necessarily drag other peoples with it. Tyrol must be free and unified; economically as well as politically it is a single whole, from which parts cannot be chipped off casually without ruining the whole. In the memorandum which the Austrian delegation laid before the Peace Conference on June 16, it explained that the Tyrolese on both sides of the Brenner are bound together by the requirements of their daily life, their economic needs, their commerce and trade, their exchange of goods and reciprocal supply of chestnuts, corn, fruit, wine, fats, etc. This mountain pass has never been a frontier, even of an administrative division within a state; the Brenner has not separated the German Tyrolese from each other, but rather bound them together. The manner of cultivating the soil, the system of land ownership, the construction of the villages, the architecture, arts, and industries; in short, everything which marks the national character of a people, is of the same character on both sides of the Brenner, and is sharply distinguished from the Trentino, which in such matters has the north Italian characteristics. . . . The division of Tyrol, cruel from a national point of view, would furthermore be disastrous to our economic interests. . . .

It was demonstrated with irrefutable arguments that the strategic considerations emphasized by the Italians are not well founded, since the heights which form the linguistic boundary in fact dominate from the south all the contested territory. These considerations have, furthermore, become without importance, since Austria has in Paragraph 8 of Part III of its counter-proposals suggested the complete neutralization of Tyrol.

Finally reference must be made to the fact that in disposing of the hereditary home-land of a people, the value and importance of the national will must not be underestimated. To close one's eyes to it and not bother about it, would be inexcusable. Those who have undertaken the task of establishing the new order in Europe and of founding the rule of international justice cannot neglect and pass over the burning desires of the Tyrolese to win back their freedom. The appeal printed below, which every community in south Tyrol has endorsed and signed, and the resolution likewise adopted on July 4 by the Landtag of Tyrol, bear new witness to the will of the entire country.

Account should be taken of the disastrous importance of the provision incorporating south Tyrol into Italy. This unfortunate people will become, if condemned to servitude, a disturbing element and a serious menace to peace and to the harmony of peoples. As soon as the Tyrolese, who today are worn out and exhausted, have recovered their strength—and this they will sooner or later do, for the Gothic strain, toughened by century-long struggle, has survived other crises—they will become conscious of their sacred duty not to be unworthy of their heroic forebears and to do honor to the shining example which history offers them in the inn-keeper of Passeier, Andreas Hofer. Then the old spirit of the Tyrolese martyr will be awakened, to fling off a yoke which fits ill with the white snow of the mountains of Tyrol, symbols of a free and independent fatherland. Then, across sore struggle and brave deeds and the harshly compromising treaty, the Tyrolese will see once more the dawning red of their freedom.

All the nations are pining and thirsting for peace. Let not the Powers which bear the responsibility for that great, sublime, and humane achievement ruin it at the start by an act of despotism. Mete out justice to Tyrol and grant peace to the entire world!

## VII. Lord Bryce on the Tyrol Decision

THE consideration in the House of Lords of the question of Tyrol, as reported in the Debates of July 16, included a discussion by Viscount Bryce of his question to the Government regarding the Austrian treaty and the Tyrol decision.

VISCOUNT BRYCE. . . . Tyrol as we have it on the map consists of two totally different parts. There is the ancient county of Tyrol, which is inhabited by a German-speaking people and which has ever since the fourteenth century formed part of the dominion of the House of Hapsburg. That is what I may call north and central Tyrol. There is also the Bishopric of Trent (south Tyrol) which is inhabited by a population speaking Italian and which is not Teutonic, and whose history and traditions are entirely different from that of north and central Tyrol. And what is now proposed, according to the statement which reaches us today, is to hand over to Italy, central Tyrol, by which I mean the southern part of the Germanic part of Tyrol—the part which lies south of the great main chain of the Rhaetic and Noric Alps. Here is a German population, speaking German, of German traditions, which has no connection whatever with Italy, and it is proposed in virtue of the treaty which is said to be in course of negotiation now to deliver that over to the alien government of the Italian Kingdom, and I want to know what possible grounds can be influencing His Majesty's Government in giving its consent to such a proposition.

It is said that this is to be done in order to give Italy a new strategic frontier. Let me ask your Lordships for a moment to consider what passed before Italy entered the war. Italy negotiated with Austria, Austria endeavoring to induce her not to join the war against her. Italy demanded a frontier from Austria which she alleged she ought to have on strategic grounds, to be protected against the Monarchy of Austria-Hungary. That frontier was to be fixed at a point called Klausen in the valley of the Eisack River, where there is a narrow gorge through which the road and railway pass, and which does constitute, according to all military authority, a very strong frontier along the whole course of the road and railway from the Brenner Pass in the north to Verona at the outlet of the Adige into the plain of Lombardy in the south.

But now what Italy asks is very much larger than what she then desired to have. Now Austria, from being the great Austro-Hungarian Empire, the great military Empire, has become a petty state of only about seven million people, and yet Italy demands as a strategic frontier against this petty Austria a far more extensive territory and a frontier far more extended to the north than she asked before the war when she was negotiating with Austria. That will appear at once to your Lordships, I think, to be a most unreasonable demand, which no strategic considerations can justify—that a nation of thirty-six millions of people, as the Italians now are, should desire this immensely extended frontier against a state which will have only seven millions.

In reality, moreover, it is a worse frontier, because the line of the Brenner is not nearly so strong a defensive position as the gorge of the river at Klausen, and because the frontier to the northwest, what is usually called the Vintschgau, is a comparatively open country, far less strong than that which Italy would have if she consented to a frontier at the point which is the true demarcation-line, the line of demarcation between the Italian-speaking and the German-speaking area of central Tyrol. That is at a place called Salurn, to the south of Bozen.

If this proposal were to be justified, surely it would be one of those cases in which the opinion of the people whom it is proposed to transfer should be taken—in other words, there should be a popular vote, or what is called a plebiscite. If that was taken in the territory which it is proposed to transfer, no

one can have the slightest doubt as to what the result of the popular vote would be. But I understand the Italians—the Italian Government, for I do not attribute this to the Italian people—in the endeavor to justify the refusal of a plebiscite, say that if a plebiscite was taken over the whole of Tyrol, it would give a majority in favor of annexation of this part to Italy. But we do not want to know what the people of the Trentino think but what the people of the part proposed to be annexed to them think, and if the plebiscite is to have any value at all it ought to be taken in the district which is affected. . . .

Here is an attempt to transfer this people as if they were so many sheep, although everybody knows perfectly well that they want to remain where they are, and not to be transferred to the government of another nation.

I should like to remind your Lordships that this is not the first time an attempt has been made to take the people of Tyrol and transfer them from one government to another. In the year 1809 Bonaparte, at the height of his power, obtained from the Austrian Government, which he had defeated, the cession of a considerable part of Tyrol, which he proposed to hand over to Bavaria. The Tyrolese rose, led by Andreas Hofer and a number of other violent leaders, and they offered a strong resistance to Napoleon and the French troops, and in that they had the cordial support of the people of England. Those who have read the history of that time will remember how strongly our sympathy went out to the Tyrolese of that day when they resisted that attempt to transfer them to another government.

I have reason to believe that that spirit is not extinct among the Tyrolese, and that if this transfer were to be carried through it would be resisted. It would be resisted, I hope, at first by peaceful methods, and I have no doubt that if the Treaty were to sanction it, the first thing the Tyrolese would do would be to go to the League of Nations and endeavor to have this injustice rectified. But if they failed no one could tell what would happen afterwards, because they are a very high-spirited people, and they would not tamely acquiesce in the injustice which it is proposed to do them.

I may add that it is doing a very bad service to the League of Nations to start it with injustices of this kind to be redressed. The League of Nations is supposed to be based upon the principle of the recognition of the rights of nationalities and the right of self-determination, and to found that League upon a treaty which at the same time sanctioned an annexation violating its principles, destroying the very moral foundation on which the League of Nations rests, will be a most unfortunate beginning for that project of which we have been venturing to hope a great deal for the future peace and welfare of Europe. . . .

LORD NEWTON [in the absence of Lord Curzon]. . . . The facts with regard to this matter are that when the Austrian peace delegation arrived in Paris they were informed that it was proposed to cede a large portion of the southern Tyrol to Italy. This annexation will, as the noble Viscount stated, include within Italian territory some 200,000 persons of the Teutonic race. The Allied peace delegates considered that, in the interests of the populations themselves, and for the purpose of security and permanence, it would be an unwise act arbitrarily to disturb the marked geographic and economic unity of the Trentino and the southern Tyrol. If that area be taken as a whole, the Italian majority for the district, it is estimated, will stand approximately in the proportion of two to one.

VISCOUNT BRYCE. Does the noble Lord mean by "the district" the whole country from the frontiers of Italy?

LORD NEWTON. The district proposed to be annexed. The frontier of the Brenner was accorded to Italy by the Treaty of London of April 25, 1915; and after hearing the representatives of the Italian delegation, the President of the United States—the Government of the United States not being party to the treaty—has agreed that the claim of the Italians to the natural frontier of the Italian peninsula is justified. . . .

## VIII. The Census Figures

ACCORDING to the last official census, that of 1910, the ethnological distribution in central Tyrol and south Tyrol, which are annexed to Italy by the provisions of the Treaty of St. Germain, was as follows:

| I. BOZEN DISTRICT        |         |          |                   |
|--------------------------|---------|----------|-------------------|
|                          | Germans | Italians | Ladins            |
| Bozen City .....         | 21,129  | 1,316    | .....             |
| Bozen Rural .....        | 22,005  | 976      | .....             |
| Kaltern .....            | 16,525  | 854      | .....             |
| Kastelruth .....         | 4,607   | .....    | 4,212             |
|                          |         |          | (Grödner valley)  |
| Klausen .....            | 9,778   | 38       | .....             |
| Neumarkt .....           | 8,068   | 1,373    | .....             |
| Sarnatal .....           | 3,842   | 21       | .....             |
|                          | 86,053  | 4,578    | 4,212             |
| II. MERAN DISTRICT       |         |          |                   |
|                          | Germans | Italians | Ladins            |
| Meran .....              | 32,224  | 1,429    | .....             |
| Lana .....               | 11,817  | 162      | .....             |
| Passelir .....           | 5,127   | 78       | .....             |
|                          | 49,168  | 1,669    | .....             |
| III. SCHLANDERS DISTRICT |         |          |                   |
|                          | Germans | Italians | Ladins            |
| Schlanders .....         | 12,293  | 40       | .....             |
| Glurns .....             | 9,607   | 4        | .....             |
|                          | 21,900  | 44       | .....             |
| IV. BRIXEN DISTRICT      |         |          |                   |
|                          | Germans | Italians | Ladins            |
| Brixen .....             | 17,242  | 397      | .....             |
| Sterzing .....           | 11,509  | 16       | .....             |
|                          | 28,751  | 413      | .....             |
| V. BRUNECK DISTRICT      |         |          |                   |
|                          | Germans | Italians | Ladins            |
| Bruneck .....            | 11,179  | 277      | .....             |
| Enneberg .....           | 126     | .....    | 5,251             |
|                          |         |          | (Enneberg valley) |
| Taufers .....            | 8,716   | 7        | .....             |
| Welsberg .....           | 9,460   | 59       | .....             |
|                          | 29,481  | 343      | 5,251             |
| Totals .....             | 215,353 | 7,047    | 9,463             |

The Ladins are a race of people closely allied to the Swiss of Graubünden, descendants of the ancient Rhetians and speaking a language which is supposed to have developed directly from the Latin independent of Italian influence.

## Events of the Week

MARCH 15. Premier Lloyd George announced in the House of Commons that the British Government had decided to permit the visit to England for commercial purposes of a delegation of the Russian Coöperative Societies, subject to the right to exclude individuals. He emphasized the fact that Maxim Litvinov, because of his political propaganda in England while a diplomatic representative, would be *persona non grata* as a delegate.

Germany has carried the second Schleswig plebiscite zone. With only four districts still to be heard from, the latest figures indicate that 48,148 votes were cast for German control, and 13,025 for Danish. The city of Flensburg voted by a large majority for Germany.

The allocation of the following mandates was announced by Premier Lloyd George in the House of Commons: German East Africa to Great Britain and Belgium; German Southwest Africa to the Union of South Africa; German possessions in the Pacific Ocean south of the Equator, other than Samoa, to the Commonwealth of Australia; Samoa to New Zealand; and the German Islands north of the Equator to Japan.

The elections in South Africa have been marked by numerous Labor successes, that party having won nineteen seats as compared with the six it previously held in the House of Assembly. Jan Christian Smuts, Premier of the Union of South Africa, was elected to the Assembly with 1,720 votes. His opponents in Pretoria West received 776 votes, of which 473 were Nationalist and 303 Labor. It seems fairly certain that a second election will be necessary, as no party or combination will be strong enough to form a Government.

MARCH 17. Field Marshal Allenby has forbidden meetings, proceedings, or resolutions by the Egyptian Legislative Assembly, or the Provincial Councils, or other elective bodies or members thereof outside their legal competence. All violations of the ruling will be dealt with by martial law. This policy is apparently occasioned by the recent declaration of independence voted by some members of the Egyptian Assembly.

MARCH 18. Frank L. Polk, Under Secretary of State, has sent a third appeal to Peru and Bolivia to compose their differences and maintain peace. The representations made by the State Department are described as "urgent" though no clear view of the situation in Bolivia can be obtained on account of the rigid censorship in La Paz. The first note was occasioned by the attack on the Peruvian Legation on March 14.

MARCH 20. The Finnish Legation in Washington has received special news of a Bolshevik offensive against Finland with the German Railway as a base. The Bolsheviks, who have concentrated at Hyrsyla and Rajakontu, are attacking along a front which extends from the Lake of Ladoga to the Arctic Ocean, approximately 1,500 miles.



**LARNED'S HISTORY OF THE WORLD**  
OR  
**Seventy Centuries of the Life of Mankind**

5 volumes. Illustrated in color and black and white. 1470 pages. Bound in cloth and boards. Published at \$12.00. Our special price \$3.00.

At both stores or by mail, \$3.25

**McDEVITT-WILSON'S, Inc.**  
30 Church St. (Hudson Terminal)      55 Vesey St. New York City

## THE DIAL

requires the services of a young man, preferably a trained executive familiar with the details of a publishing office to act as Business Manager. He will direct the magazine's production, and possibly promotion, circulation, and advertising, and take charge of its business activities. The work is not editorial. Address The Dial by letter indicating qualifications and salary—Box N, 152 West 13th Street, New York City.

Dinner of

## The Committee of 48

"Political Parties and the Present Situation"

Speakers:—

Philip Francis, William Hard,  
Basil Manly

ALDINE CLUB, 200 Fifth Ave.,  
7 P. M. April 5th      Tickets \$3.50

Send your reservations to  
**COMMITTEE OF FORTY-EIGHT**  
15 East 40th St.,      New York City